DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 622 JC 880 234

AUTHOR Jackson, Edward John
TITLE A Comparative Study To Determine the Effectiveness of Adjunct Faculty in the Business Division at Fayetteville Technical Institute.
PUB DATE Jun 86
NOTE 115p.; Ed.D. major applied research project, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Faculty Evaluation; *Full Time Faculty; *Grading; *Part Time Faculty; Student Attrition; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teacher Effectiveness; Technical Institutes; Two Year Colleges; *Withdrawal (Education)

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted at Fayetteville Technical Institute to compare the effectiveness of full- and part-time faculty in terms of evaluations from department chairs, student evaluations, grades assigned, and class attrition. Study findings, based on evaluation results, grades, and attrition rates for 37 full-time and 47 part-time faculty employed by the Business Division, included the following: (1) students gave full-time instructors higher ratings than part-time instructors, with significant differences emerging with respect to knowledge of subject area, formal classroom presentation of material, knowledge of teaching methods, and starting classes on time; (2) on 7 of the 12 criteria used by the department chair to evaluate faculty, there were no significant differences between the ratings of full- and part-time faculty; (3) of the total chairperson ratings on all criteria, 7% of the full-time faculty and 12% of the part-time faculty were rated as not meeting job requirements; (4) on average, adjunct faculty gave slightly higher grades than full-time faculty; and (5) full-time faculty retained a higher percentage of students than part-time faculty. Evaluation forms are appended, and 57 references are listed. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294622

A COMPARATIVE STUDY TO DETERMINE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY IN THE BUSINESS DIVISION AT FAYETTEVILLE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

by

Edward John Jackson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. J. Jackson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Major Applied Research Project presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University

June, 1986

IC 880 234

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge my appreciation to Dr. Boyd Ayers, Cluster Coordinator, and Dr. Linwood Powell, Research Assistant, for their guidance and assistance over the past four years. I express my sincere appreciation to my major advisor, Dr. John Losak, and my cental staff reader, Dr. Philip DeTurk, for their advice and assistance.

I wish to thank the full-time and adjunct instructors in the Business Division of Fayetteville Technical Institute for their cooperation in providing the information tabulated in this study. I also wish to thank the students that completed the evaluations and participated in this project.

I would like to recognize Dr. Freddie Joe Ward who provided guidance and motivational fortitude to complete this project. I would also like to thank my secretaries, Sally Graves and Patty Phillips for tolerating me during the completion phase of this study.

Finally, I wish to dedicate this study to my typist, Eleanor, who also happens to be my wife. She has spent many long hours adjusting the content and retyping this study and all other course requirements over the past four years. This is also dedicated to my daughters Diane and Kristie who have tolerated the absense of both mother and father.

Abstract of a Major Applied Research Project Presented
to Nova University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Education

A COMPARATIVE STUDY TO DETERMINE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY IN THE BUSINESS DIVISION AT FAYETTEVILLE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

by

Edward J. Jackson

June, 1986

Fayetteville Technical Institute's enrollment, during the Fall Quarter 1985, increased by thirty-four percent. Over the past two years full-time faculty increased by twelve to the current level of one hundred sixty-five employees. During the same period there was an increase of forty-three adjunct faculty members bringing the present total to one hundred eighty-two. With the increasing ratio of adjunct faculty to full-time faculty, and the projected growth in student enrollment, the utilization of adjunct faculty has become a major issue. The effectiveness of instruction for both groups must be comparable. An in-depth evaluation is required to determine if full-time faculty and adjunct faculty members are equally effective in providing the same instruction to the students.

There were four null hypotheses investigated in this study. They are:

1. There is no significant difference in the student evaluations of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty.

2. There is no significant difference in the Department Chairman evaluation of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty.

3. There is no significant difference between the grades of students receiving instruction from full-time faculty and adjunct faculty.

4. There is no significant difference in the attrition of students receiving instruction from full-time faculty and adjunct faculty.

The sample used in this study includes all of the thirty-seven full-time and forty-seven adjunct faculty members employed by the Business Division during the Fall Quarter 1985 at Fayetteville Technical Institute. The Business Division offers fifteen different curricula that represent approximately twenty-five percent of all curricula, full-time faculty, adjunct faculty and students at Fayetteville Technical Institute. The four comparative evaluative measures used in this study are student evaluations, Department Chairman evaluations, student grades and student attrition. A chi-square of the crossbreak construction of percentages was used to test hypotheses 1, 2 and 4. An independent t-test was used to test hypothesis 3.

The results of this study justified the following findings. Using the four evaluative measures it was

determined that both groups provided comparably effective instruction to the students. Full-time faculty provided better evaluative measures, more consultations outside the classroom, better student retention, and were more aware of audio-visual availability and usage. Adjunct faculty were more apt to stay current in professional development, adhere to the dress code, and tend to give "C" or better grades. Both groups need improvement in classroom administration, implementation of school policies, and in care, maintenance and security of classrooms.

On the basis of this study the following recommendations were made. The evaluation instruments require revision to accommodate both groups. There is a definite need for in-service developmental activities. Using a formal and appropriate process that applies to both groups, a committee should be established to appraise and revise the Faculty Evaluative Criteria and Student Evaluation instruments. The faculty advisory committee should actively assist in developing, planning, coordinating and evaluating faculty developmental activities. Fayetteville Technical Institute should designate staff members to carry out regular faculty development activities. The committee should be responsible for identifying internal resources for in-service activities. In-service activities should be closely related to the goals of Fayetteville Technical Institute. It was recommended that new orientation strategies be developed for both groups.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES viii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 2

Background and Significance 5

Research Question 11

Null Hypotheses 11

Definition of Terms 12

Limitations 12

Assumptions 13

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 14

3. METHODOLOGY 30

4. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 35

5. INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . 73

Interpretation of Results 73

Conclusions 85

Recommendations 86

Strategies for Diffusion, Implementation and Change 91

BIBLIOGRAPHY 92

APPENDIXES

A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR PERFORMANCE . . 97

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

Page

B. FACULTY EVALUATIONS 98

C. COMPARISON OF THE BUSINESS DIVISION SAMPLE POPULATION TO THE OVERALL POPULATION AT FAYETTEVILLE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE 102

D. CURRICULUM IN THE BUSINESS DIVISION 103

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Is Generally Knowledgeable of Content Area	37
2.	Is Interesting in Presentation of the Material.	38
3.	Makes Course Objectives Clear	38
4.	Follows Stated Objectives in Presentation of the Material	39
5.	Makes Clear Assignments	40
6.	Student Responses for Teaching Methods Questions 1 Through 5	40
7.	Consolidation of Tables Used to Determine the Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty Ratings for Overall Teaching Methods	41
8.	Tells Students How They Will Be Tested and Graded	42
9.	Gives Tests on the Material Covered	43
10.	Returns Papers and Tests Within a Reasonable Time According to Type and Length of Paper or Test and Class Size	44
11.	Provides Enough Tests, Projects, and Written Assignments that are Sufficient to Evaluate the Work Done	44
12.	Student Responses for Evaluation Methods Questions 6 Through 9	45
13.	Consolidation of Tables Used to Determine the Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty Ratings for Overall Evaluation Methods	46
14.	Is Available for Student Conferences During Scheduled Office Hours or by Appointment	47
15.	Is Concerned with Student Progress	47

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

Table		Page
16.	Encourages Classroom Participation of the Student	48
17.	Student Responses for Instructor Attitudes Questions 10 Through 12	49
18.	Consolidation of Tables Used to Determine the Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty Ratings for Overall Attitudes of Instructors	49
19.	Generally Begins Class on Scheduled Time	50
20.	Remains in Classroom, Lab, or Shop During Class Period	51
21.	Generally Releases Class on Scheduled Time	52
22.	Student Responses for Classroom Administration Techniques Questions 13 Through 15	52
23.	Consolidation of Tables Used to Determine the Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty Ratings for Overall Administrative Duties	53
24.	Overall Student Evaluation Responses	54
25.	Exhibits Responsible Implementation of All Policies and Procedures of the College	55
26.	Anticipates Equipment, Textbook, and Supply Needs	56
27.	Shows Proper Concern for the Care, Maintenance, and Security of Equipment in the Classroom, Laboratory, Shop	57
28.	Promptly Submits Reports, Grades, Et Cetera	58
29.	Exhibits a Cooperative Attitude in the Performance of All Responsibilities. Keeps Abreast of Changes Within His or Her Discipline	59
30.	Meets Classes Regularly and Punctually. Makes Course Objectives Clear, Informs Students of Criteria for Testing and Grading. Teaches and Tests to Meet Objectives	60

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

Table		Page
31.	Appropriate Use of Instructional Aids	61
32.	Evaluates Courses and Tries to Improve Them	61
33.	Available to Students for Out-of-Classroom Instruction and Advising	62
34.	Fulfills Role in Departmental Duties	63
35.	Participates in Professional Developmental Programs	64
36.	Adheres to Dress Requirements	65
37.	Overall Department Chairman Evaluation Responses Criteria 1 Through 12	66
38.	A Comparison of Percentages of Department Chairman Evaluations of Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty	67
39.	Independent Sample Background for Average of Student Grades	69
40.	A Comparison of Letter Grades Received by the Student Population Taught by Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty in the Business Division	70
41.	Attrition/Retention of Students	72

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

More than a quarter of a million adjunct faculty are employed in American colleges and universities (NCES, 1980). The number of adjunct faculty has steadily increased over the last three decades and their role in higher education may well expand in coming years. By 1980 thirty-two percent of all faculty were adjunct faculty (NCES, 1980). Fifty-three percent of these adjunct faculty are in two-year colleges, thirty-four percent are in four-year colleges and thirteen percent are in universities (Eliason, 1980; Tuckman, 1978). Therefore, their teaching performance can and does affect the overall quality of academic programs. Institutions by and large have recognized that adjunct faculty can be a major asset to their academic and financial programs. Tuckman and Tuckman (1981), believed that increased numbers of adjunct faculty will pose a challenge when they said:

> The jury remains out on the question of whether part-timers augment the quality of higher education or whether they debase it. Whether they will become a larger force in the next two decades will depend, in large part, on the policies that institutions of higher education will adopt in the next few years. Part-timers are neither good nor bad for academe in their own right. Instead they are a diverse group with many different motives and goals. Whether we learn to employ them in a constructive manner will surely be one of the most fascinating questions of the '80's (Tuckman and Tuckman, 1981:7).

Statement of the Problem

The issue of using adjunct faculty at Fayetteville Technical Institute is controversial. Both faculty and administration acknowledge that there are benefits and threats to the institution and educational mission.

Fayetteville Technical Institute had a duplicated headcount of 17,752 seats filled during the Fall Quarter 1985. Of this duplicated headcount, 4,260 seats were filled at night when many of the adjunct faculty members are employed. Students who are enrolled in evening courses are usually employed during the day and attend Fayetteville Technical Institute as part-time students. These part-time students are enrolled to refine their skills or to obtain new skills in an effort to be more competitive.

Not all evening courses are taught by adjunct faculty. The teaching load for full-time faculty includes evening courses. Likewise, adjunct faculty are employed for daytime classes during peak times of course offerings and in specialized areas. Fayetteville Technical Institute strives to obtain an equal distribution or ratio of full-time and adjunct faculty throughout the instructional day. Full-time and part-time students are found in classes taught by both full-time and adjunct faculty and thus, are exposed to the same methods of instruction.

During the Fall Quarter 1985 Fayetteville Technical Institute's student enrollment increased by thirty-four percent. Currently, Fayetteville Technical Institute employs 165 full-time faculty and 182 adjunct faculty. These employment figures represent an increase of twelve full-time faculty and forty-three adjunct faculty over the past two years. During this two year period, the full-time faculty members increased by eight percent, and adjunct faculty members increased by thirty-one percent. With this increasing ratio of adjunct faculty to full-time faculty and the projected growth in student enrollment, the utilization of adjunct faculty has become a major issue. Thirty-two percent of the 1,225 classes taught during the Fall Quarter 1985 were taught by adjunct faculty. The effectiveness of instruction provided by both groups must be comparable. Prior to the Fall Quarter 1985, adjunct faculty received evaluations by the students only. Full-time faculty were evaluated not only by the students, but with an annual evaluation by the administration. Neither of these evaluations, alone, can adequately measure the effectiveness of instruction provided to the students.

Judgments about the effectiveness of instruction provided by adjunct faculty, like all subjective evaluations, are influenced heavily by the perspective of the assessor. A mature adult student may place great value on the pragmatic outlook and real-world wisdom that many adjunct faculty bring into the classroom. Teaching

performance can and does affect the overall quality of academic programs.

Full-time faculty members are frequently selected from the ranks of adjunct faculty. To provide a strong foundation for the selection process of highly qualified applicants, effective evaluation procedures must be used. According to the Dean of Instruction at Fayetteville Technical Institute, the current evaluation methods have been adequate tools in assessing the effectiveness of full-time faculty members. He felt that with the increased numbers of adjunct faculty the use of these tools may be inadequate in the assessment of both groups. These instruments have been used for the past ten years with annual revisions. The administration has used these evaluation tools to assist in counseling faculty on their strong and weak points. Because of the past effectiveness with full-time faculty, the Dean of Instruction requested that for the purpose of this study, these evaluation instruments also be used to evaluate adjunct faculty. Based on the findings, he stated, revisions of these instruments may be necessary to accommodate the effective evaluation of both full-time and adjunct faculty members (Norris, 1985).

The effectiveness of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty can be assessed by using additional variables of student grades and the attrition of students who start with that faculty member's course of instruction, and then withdraw from that course prior to its completion. By

comparing the faculty performance on the four variables of (1) student evaluation; (2) Department Chairman evaluation; (3) student grades and (4) student attrition; the effectiveness of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty members can be assessed.

Background and Significance

Much has been written on behalf of the adjunct faculty member. The understanding seems to be that the number of adjunct faculty members will most surely increase. With this expected expansion, the problems associated will persist unless positive steps are taken.

Smith (1980:61), defined part-time or adjunct faculty as "All faculty who have a tenuous appointment and less than a reciprocal career commitment with the institution...it is the psychological, not the economic commitment between the person and the institution that makes the difference in their relationship." This would suggest that, although their motivations for accepting part-time positions may be varied, there are certain difficulties almost every adjunct faculty member faces by the very nature of his or her part-time status. Whether one is newly-degreed and desperately looking for a "foot in the door" to full-time teaching, or someone who teaches a class to supplement his or her income, proper evaluation will prepare this person for continuing service (Smith, 1980).

Most people desire to know the answer to the question, "How am I doing?" They want to know what is expected of them, how well they are meeting the expectations, and how they can improve. Process motivation theories emphasize the importance of feed-back to the individual, while content or substantive theories speak of esteem, respect, recognition, and achievement (Boggs, 1984).

Instructor evaluation is not frequently at the top of the administrator's list of priorities. Very often, performance appraisals are perfunctory and are done more to satisfy a policy or administrative handbook requirement. Nonetheless, administrators must come to realize that instructor evaluation is one of their most important functions. While faculty members are often too quick to point to a lack of administrative concern for quality, they are usually wary of any sudden interest in their performance. Instructor evaluation remains a very sensitive area. The instructor's status and future are being tested or reinforced with each evaluation (Norris, 1980).

Friedlander's (1979, 1980) studies examined the proposition that the instruction by adjunct faculty is equal in quality to that of full-time faculty. His studies compared instructor characteristics, backgrounds, availability and institutional support services, but not the quality of instruction. Some examples of the findings for the various criteria follow:

Teaching experience: ninety percent of full-time faculty and fifty-five percent of adjunct faculty had more than three years of teaching experience; fifty-five percent of the adjunct faculty, but only thirteen percent of the full-time faculty had taught at the community college where currently employed for two years or less.

Selection of course material: fifty-three percent of adjunct faculty compared with eleven percent of full-time faculty, stated that they had no control over the selection of textbooks used in their classes.

Use of support services: full-time faculty were more likely than adjunct faculty to use clerical help (sixty-eight percent versus fifty-one percent), library and bibliographic assistance (forty-three percent versus thirty-four percent), and media production facilities or assistance (forty percent versus thirty-one percent). More adjunct faculty than full-time faculty reported that these services were not available to them.

Availability to students: lack of office space and adequate opportunities and incentives to meet students out of class discouraged adjunct faculty from trying to provide individualized support to students.

Improvement in professional activities: seventy-seven percent of full-time faculty and sixty-seven percent of adjunct faculty reported they read scholarly journals, eighty-two percent of full-time faculty and sixty-three percent of adjunct faculty belonged to a professional organization, forty-eight percent of full-time faculty and thirty-eight percent of adjunct faculty had attended a professional meeting, and eleven percent of full-time faculty and eight percent of adjunct faculty had presented a professional paper (Friedlander, 1980:29-34).

Bridges, et al (1971), developed criteria for identifying the characteristics of best and worst college teachers according to preferences stated by students, faculty, and administrators. The items assessed enthusiasm, preparation and organization, presentation, class

discussion, interest in students, evaluation and personality. Students tend to give superior ratings to those professors who are interested, open and enthusiastic, but who show little concern for research and scholarly efforts. Faculty and administrators tend to give higher ratings to those who engage heavily in research and publication (Manning, 1975).

Three important points were brought to focus by Smock (1973). In evaluating college faculty he concluded that evaluations should include information from all sources. 1. Colleagues are best able to judge quality and appropriateness of course content and related matter. 2. Departmental administration are best able to determine whether faculty members fulfill administrative duties associated with the instruction. 3. Students are best able to judge the effectiveness of the teaching act (Manning, 1975).

The most commonly used method of evaluation of teaching effectiveness of the adjunct faculty and frequently the only method used at Fayetteville Technical Institute is the student evaluation. Student ratings provide the most important systematically collected data for evaluating college teaching (Greenwood and Ramagli, 1980). The data are easy to obtain, students observe every class and teachers respond to student criticism with change (Centra, 1973, 1977; O'Hanlon and Mortensen, 1980).

Although the validity of student evaluations is not universally accepted, they have as much support as other procedures (Greenwood and Ramagli, 1980). Nevertheless, some practices threaten validity. Student ratings are higher for example, when the instructor is present (Miller, 1972). Validity is affected by allowing too little time for thoughtful comments by respondents, by administering the forms immediately after an examination when attitudes may interfere with objectivity, or by an instructor failing to support the process. Students must believe their input will have an impact (O'Hanlon and Mortensen, 1980).

Comprehensive evaluation programs for adjunct faculty are rare in all sectors of higher education (Leslie, Kellums and Gunne, 1982; Sewell, Bryden and Plosser, 1976). Most colleges do not have performance-based criteria for renewal of adjunct faculty appointments, which makes adjunct faculty much more vulnerable to random off-hand evaluation comments by students or other faculty (Maher and Ebben, 1978).

Evaluations of adjunct faculty should include evidence of the quality of work being required of and accomplished by students. In evening classes, both the faculty member and the students often are unwinding after a long day's work elsewhere. The temptation is strong not to insist on heavy reading assignments, essay tests, and lengthy papers (Maher and Ebben, 1978).

It is evident from previous studies that more than one measure of evaluation is necessary to properly assess the effectiveness of full-time and adjunct faculty members. The total evaluation process necessary to compare the effectiveness of adjunct faculty should include the variables of (1) student evaluations of faculty; (2) evaluation of faculty by the Department Chairman; (3) the grades of the students completing the course of instruction; and (4) the attrition of students from the faculty member's class as per the findings of Elioff, 1980; Hammons, 1981; Behrendt and Parsons, 1983; Friedlander, 1980; and Willett, 1980. Segments of these evaluation variables were used with success in the studies conducted at Elgin Community College in Illinois, Vista College in California, Siena Heights College in Michigan, Burlington County Community College in New Jersey, and Hagerstown Junior College in Maryland. These studies found the four variables to be acceptable and used them to compare effectiveness of instruction by full-time and adjunct faculty.

The Dean of Instruction and the faculty participating in this study agreed that these were acceptable variables to use in determining the effectiveness of both groups. Using these recommendations, the null hypotheses were derived to investigate the effectiveness of full-time and adjunct faculty in the Business Division of Fayetteville Technical Institute.

Research Question

This study is designed to determine if there is a difference in the effectiveness of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty in the Business Division at Fayetteville Technical Institute, as measured by four procedures.

Null Hypotheses

There are four null hypotheses investigated in this study. Each null hypothesis is directly related to the effectiveness of full-time and adjunct faculty members. The null hypotheses which were developed based on the desires of the Dean of Instruction and previous studies are:

1. There is no significant difference in the student evaluations of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty when evaluated using the Fayetteville Technical Institute Student Evaluation Form (See Appendix A).

2. There is no significant difference in the Department Chairman evaluation of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty using the Fayetteville Technical Institute Faculty Evaluation form (See Appendix B).

3. There is no significant difference between the grades of the students receiving instruction from full-time faculty and adjunct faculty.

4. There is no significant difference in the attrition of students receiving instruction from full-time faculty and adjunct faculty.

Definition of Terms

Full-Time Faculty: Those faculty members that are employed as full-time instructors teaching a minimum of eighteen contact hours per week. They are entitled to all state benefits.

Adjunct-Faculty: Those individuals hired to teach on a course by course contract, not to exceed one quarter per contract. They receive only contact hourly pay with no other state benefits provided.

Student Attrition: The numbers of students in the sample population who withdrew from a surveyed class, prior to completion of that course, during the Fall Quarter 1985. Class rosters are developed after the drop/add period and twenty percent of that class contact hours have been met. Student attrition at Fayetteville Technical Institute included all students who were enrolled and attended one class after the twenty percent date had been reached.

Limitations

1. The findings of this study are based solely on data collected from the Fall 1985 Quarter in the Business

Division at Fayetteville Technical Institute and can not be generalized beyond the faculty, students and administration at Fayetteville Technical Institute.

2. The current Faculty Evaluative Criteria instruments used by the faculty, administration or students were the only instruments utilized.

3. Other independent variables were present but not considered and may have an effect on the overall results of this study. Some of these variables include: text books, classrooms, student attitudes, and student characteristics.

Assumptions

1. It is assumed that a study of this nature will yield insight into the effectiveness of instruction of full-time and adjunct faculty members.

2. It is further assumed that the sample used from the Business Division, in the study, is representative of all students at Fayetteville Technical Institute.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Nationally, fifty-three percent of the instructors at community colleges are adjunct faculty (Gappa, 1984). The quality of their teaching performance is a major determinant of the institution's effectiveness. At the convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in 1979, the issue of standards for adjunct teaching was debated. Proponents of high standards argued that adjunct faculty should be trained not only in subject matter but also in pedagogy and professional ethics. Pragmatists maintained that two-year colleges had little choice but to take whoever walked in the door and agreed to work for "coolie wages" (Eliason, 1980).

Doyle (1983), indicated that the most important philosophical issue underlying instructional evaluation arose from a certain tension between the concepts of academic freedom and academic responsibility. Academic freedom was cited as an argument against evaluating teaching in circumstances where evaluation genuinely encumbered the pursuit of dissemination of knowledge. Another source of tension centered around the notion that an instructor's credentials, position, and expertise precluded evaluation. Some felt that until we knew more about evaluation, we should do nothing. In Doyle's study, others indicated that

the failure to evaluate could lead to sins more grievous than would evaluation with uncertainty. In the face of increasing demands placed upon faculty to furnish more and more evidence supporting the amount, quality, and value of what they do, many faculty members wanted to do away with intrusive evaluation policies, while students and administrators pushed for objective data to facilitate decisions and guarantee educational quality (Doyle, 1983).

Doyle also discussed the psychometric issue of instructional evaluation. The issue was concerned with whether evaluation should focus on instructional outcomes or on instructional processes. The problems encountered when evaluating teaching by measuring student learning were both philosophical and methodological. The process of evaluting teaching by measuring course and instructor characteristics and behaviors indicative of good teaching was no less complex. A reasonable goal would be to devise an evaluation plan that would encompass the strengths of process measures and guard against their weaknesses (Doyle, 1983).

In a study designed by Elioff (1980), to improve instruction by part-time faculty, she suggested that through a nonpunitive evaluation process, needs for instructional improvement should be identified and linked with appropriate faculty development activities. She cited a retrospective overview on the inadequacies of faculty who were hired during the intensive growth period of community colleges and the need to improve the quality of teaching. This overview

was contributed by Scigliano (1978:154), who wrote:

> Two decades ago most individuals now in this profession were thrown together much as were National Football League expansion teams; they were recruited from high schools, universities, four-year colleges, businesses and myriad others known at that time. These persons joined to serve a new clientele in a middle level space in the higher education spectrum. Rapid expansion during 1960-1970 provided little time for concern about competencies in the newly formed profession; the search for more and more personnel to cope with the rising tide of students became the biggest problem. As the sixties passed and enrollments began to level off, concern shifted from within the college to the nature and quality of professional staff. Competency is a perishable commodity, even though teachers may have been competent initially, their skills were soon questioned.

While the information available that compared the teaching effectiveness of full-time and adjunct faculty in community colleges was minimal and inconclusive, it appeared that adjunct faculty by themselves did not detract from the quality of instruction and that they could greatly enrich it. The key to success was found in how adjunct faculty were selected, supported and assigned (Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne, 1982).

Comprehensive evaluation programs for adjunct faculty are rare in all sectors of higher education (Leslie, Kellams and Gunne, 1982; Sewell, Brydon and Plosser, 1976). Most colleges were found not to have performance-based criteria for renewal of adjunct faculty appointments, which made adjunct faculty more vulnerable to random, off-hand evaluation comments by students or other faculty (Maher and Ebben, 1978).

Evaluation is perhaps the most discussed and least understood concept in the literature describing community colleges today. In the analysis of the American community college, Cohen and Brawer (1972), suggested that the intent of evaluation is to make faculty aware of their strengths and weaknesses thereby producing change leading to instructional improvement. Practically, they felt that evaluation has had little effect. If the Cohen and Brawer allegation is true, then more than a decade of effort has been wasted (Behrendt and Parsons, 1983).

Evaluation has been seen as a process for realizing both accountability and parity. If students were learning, did it matter whether they were taught by full-time or adjunct personnel? In the instructional milieu, the same expectations could be held for full-time or adjunct teachers. Therefore, the same evaluation procedures could be used. Hammons (1981:51-52), summarized the issue by saying, "The whole area of appraisal or evaluation of part-time faculty requires careful consideration, beginning with determining the purposes of the evaluation process and continuing through delineation of areas of appraisal, criteria to be used, standards to be applied, and the procedures." (Behrendt and Parsons, 1983).

Despite the development of sophisticated evaluation programs, the literature revealed that community college practitioners have yet to reach a consensus as to the purposes and method of faculty evaluation. The many

criticisms of faculty evaluation programs indicate the need for continued research in the development of evaluation systems that enhance faculty development and student learning.

One of the major problems cited in the literature was that faculty evaluation systems often have two contradictory purposes: to enhance faculty development efforts by assessing the strengths and weaknesses of individual instructors and to determine whether the employment of a faculty member should be continued or terminated. Cohen (1974:21), argued that such dual-purpose evaluation systems are counterproductive and damaging to morale: "One faculty evaluation scheme cannot both judge and assist. The procedure that gathers evidence for dismissal is different from that which reflects a climate of support, of communication, and of growth inducement." Mark (1977:5), noted that most writers on the subject concurred with Cohen and that the literature "Demands the separation of the evaluation process into the goals of development and of promotion, salary, and retention." Yet Mark's review of the literature and of predominant practices leads her to conclude that there has been little research into how the two goals of evaluation can be separated. "The outcome," she reports, "is more judgment and less assistance." Faculty continue to fear and distrust the evaluation process according to a study by Palmer (1983).

Faculty members are professionals. They work independently of colleagues and supervisors, but closely with the students. They have been highly educated or trained to do their jobs, and they exercise considerable control over their own work (Mintzberg, 1979). Community college faculty are independent, inner-directed people who must arrive at ideas for themselves and who need to create their own processes and solutions (Hert, 1984). It would be a mistake to ignore these characteristics when designing or implementing any faculty evaluation process (Boggs, 1984).

Friedlander (1980), concluded that differences between full-time and adjunct faculty are the results of differences in the education and experiential preparation of adjunct faculty. He contended that teaching experience and length of service at the college, presumably would enhance a faculty member's ability to conduct a course. Time is required for faculty to learn what instructional support services are available and to develop courses and effective instructional techniques. Because adjunct faculty employment is less continuous, it can be assumed that adjunct faculty do not have the same level of knowledge about the institution and the available resources as full-time faculty. Normally, adjunct faculty are not provided office space or office hours to meet with students nor adequate opportunities and incentives to increase their understanding of the college. These factors have inhibited adjunct faculty efforts to fulfill their extrainstructional

responsibilities (Friedlander, 1980 and Sewell, Brydon and Plosser, 1976).

Friedlander (1980), concluded that the quality of instruction provided by a college is likely to be adversely affected as the proportion of adjunct to full-time faculty increases. Others who have compared the teaching performance of adjunct and full-time faculty have refuted Friedlander's study. Hammons (1981), suggested that the results achieved by adjunct faculty or full-time faculty, including performance in follow-up courses, attrition rates, or changes in attitudes should have been Friedlander's focus rather than teaching experience, use of media and grading practices.

Teaching effectiveness and the cost of full-time and adjunct faculty at a pseudonymous Midwestern Community College were compared. Three evaluation forms for students, for faculty, and for administrators were used. While some items differed from one form to another, the three groups registered no statistically significant differences in the evaluations of full-time and adjunct teachers. The researchers also discovered that adjunct faculty cost considerably less than full-time faculty, no matter what measures of output were used. They concluded that at Midwestern Community College, adjunct faculty were as effective as full-time faculty and at lower costs (Cruise, Furst, and Klimes, 1980).

The instructional effectiveness of the full-time and adjunct faculty at Elgin Community College in Illinois was the focus of another study. The variables measured were students' ratings of teachers' effectiveness, class retention rates and subsequent student achievement in advanced classes. Class retention was calculated by dividing total enrollment in the class after the first week by the number of students who received a passing grade in the course. Student's achievement in subsequent courses was measured by comparing grades earned in initial courses with enrollment and grades earned in more advanced classes in the same discipline. No significant differences were found between full-time and adjunct faculty for these dimensions of instructional effectiveness. With declining enrollments and dwindling resources, administrators will be more inclined to increase the use of adjunct faculty because they can be expected to deliver quality instruction to their students (Willett, 1980).

Adjunct faculty who are not familiar with community colleges need to understand their missions, goals, programs and procedures and be aware of students' particular educational needs. Most adjunct faculty have been employed for their professional competence, not for their pedagogical training. It is the responsibility of the employing institution to provide adequate orientation, in-service training, evaluation of faculty and opportunities for faculty development (Grymes, 1977; McDougle, 1980).

Faculty development involves activities designed to renew, upgrade, extend, or change the professional and pedagogical skills of faculty. Most models of faculty development assume that the quality of teaching can be improved when faculty share information about their teaching methods and when good teaching is valued and rewarded. A major problem is that faculty development models are normally concerned with full-time faculty (Cole, 1978). In their 1982 survey, Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne inquired about support for research, teaching improvement, and professional development. Overall, about one-fourth of the institutions surveyed made some effort to assist their adjunct faculty.

At Vista College in California more than 350 adjunct faculty teach over eighty-five percent of the college's classes each semester. The college offers general education and occupational courses to over 14,000 adult part-time students. While each faculty member has a program planner or administrator to contact with questions, he or she is essentially alone with the students out in the community. The small ratio of administrative support personnel to teaching faculty means that Vista College's adjunct faculty must be able to perform the multiple roles of public relations, learning diagnostician, instructional planner, teacher, counselor and registrar. Elioff (1980), suggested that administrative evaluations and observations be carried out independently of faculty self-evaluations. A faculty development director, who is outside of the hiring process,

should study both sets of data to make decisions about activities needed to improve the instructional program (Elioff, 1980).

Siena Heights College, a small private institution in Michigan, was awarded a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education to experiment with a model for development of adjunct faculty. Siena Heights enrolls only 1100 students; it has forty full-time faculty, with another eight or nine full-time enrollment faculty comprised of adjunct faculty (Maher and Ebben, 1978). In contrast with Vista College, Siena Heights wanted a plan for long-term development of a pool of qualified people who could sustain a continuing association with a college. Administrators believed that a program responding to the personal and professional needs of adjunct faculty would enable them to build more permanent links with the institution. The aim was to reduce the high turnover of adjunct faculty and increase the standardization and quality of instruction (Gappa, 1984).

Burlington County Community College in New Jersey employs 170 adjunct faculty and 110 full-time faculty. It began in-service institutes for adjunct faculty in 1971. Participants were paid if they completed the work assigned and attended the session. Completion of an institute was one prerequisite for advancement to the status of senior adjunct faculty and higher pay (Pierce and Miller, 1980).

At Hagerstown Junior College in Maryland, the staff who developed their evaluation system found no significant differences between full-time and adjunct faculty. The evaluation method used to compare the two variables consisted of a student questionnaire and a classroom observation by the supervisor of classroom practices. The results of the student evaluations were tabulated and frequencies and percentages were computed for each question. Later, the staff tested the validity of their instrument by comparing their results with those obtained by using the IDEA (Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment) system developed at Kansas State University. Again, IDEA found no significant difference between full-time and adjunct faculty (Behrandt and Parsons, 1983).

Hagerstown Junior College illustrated concepts of two-way evaluations. The adjunct faculty member's teaching is evaluated, and the adjunct faculty member evaluates the services rendered by the college. The results of both evaluations are assessed and used to improve the other five components of Hagerstown's comprehensive program: recruitment, orientation, communication, instructional development and support services. The Hagerstown model makes evaluation an integral and expected part of instructional practice. Faculty do not perceive it as irrelevant or as a threat (Behrendt and Parsons, 1983; and Parsons, 1980). Evaluation is first discussed during orientation, when the Dean of Instruction and the Division

Chairman interview the adjunct faculty. During the interview, the expectations of the college are discussed and strategies for realizing these expectations explored. Evaluation is discussed again at the beginning of each semester, during the orientation workshop. Adjunct faculty are reminded that evaluations will be scheduled at a mutually convenient time. Those who have participated in the evaluation process previously are urged to share their reactions with those who have not (Behrendt and Parsons, 1983).

Boggs (1984), found that evaluation is high on the list of faculty concerns. The extent to which the evaluation procedure can be used to improve instruction (formative process) versus its use in making personnel decisions (summative process) is of utmost importance (Armiger, 1981; O'Hanlon and Mortensen, 1980). Available data suggests that a majority of the faculty favor a formal evaluation procedure that includes observations by students, colleagues, and department chairmen. Most even agree that this information should be used in making personnel decisions (Miller, 1972; Boggs, 1984).

Although peer review has been widely used in the evaluation of research, its role in evaluating teaching has been largely ignored (French-Lazovik, 1981). Faculty tend to resist peer observation (O'Hanlon and Mortensen, 1980). Although there has been little or no research into the reasons for this reluctance, it appears to be based upon the

possible intimidating environment of performing before a colleague. Another limitation to the use of colleagues in the evaluation process is that colleagues often have a protective bias (Centra, 1977; O'Hanlon and Mortensen, 1980; Boggs, 1984). Peer judgements made without the protection of anonymity lack both reliability and validity (French-Lazovik, 1981; Boggs, 1984).

It is rare to find self-appraisal in use in any organized fashion in education today. Studies indicate that a faculty member is most likely to act on data which he has collected (O'Hanlon and Mortensen, 1980). A significant improvement in subsequent student ratings frequently occurs after a moderate discrepancy has been identified between student ratings and the instructor's self-rating (Carroll, 1981; Centra, 1973, 1977; and Boggs, 1984).

The main limitation to this method is that instructors tend to rate themselves higher than do students or peers. The validity of these data would certainly be questionable in any summative process. One's objectivity can be questioned when one's teaching career hangs in the balance (Boggs, 1984).

Oliver (1984), found that most departmental chairmen have no formal training in personnel administration. His report is geared toward assisting departmental heads with how to evaluate as well as what to evaluate. He stated that:

> Evaluating university teaching is a process designed to assist instructors achieve individual as well as organizational goals. Student

> evaluations and departmental chair evaluations validate the assessment. Only when the goals of the university and the objectives of each unit are established, and the personnel process integrated, does there become the possibility of achieving the results intended by the master plan for development. Self-development is critical to the performance of each university instructor (Oliver, 1984:40).

In an article recommending ways to improve the work environment for part-time instructors, Norman (1984:14), makes the following points relating to evaluation and quality of instruction.

> All part-time faculty must be evaluated on a regular, routine basis. This is the only way to assure that quality education is occuring in the classroom. Evaluation procedures must be consistent with institutional goals and follow the same criteria established for evaluation of full-time faculty. Part-time faculty must be informed at the time they are hired that they will be evaluated. The evaluation process must be fully explained. They must be told who will do the evaluation, when it will occur, and how the results of the evaluation will be used. The evaluation should include assessments by students and by departmental or division heads, and may include peer evaluations conducted by full-time faculty. The departmental evaluation should include a classroom visit. The results of the evaluation should be discussed thoroughly with the part-time faculty member by the department chair. The results should form a basis for improvement, not just dismissal. If certain remedies are recommended, the departmental mentor should be used.

Cashin (1983), stated that reliability is very much tied to the number of raters; the more raters, the higher the reliability. Studies have found correlations between student ratings and colleague or administrator ratings to range from 0.43 to 0.69. Poole (1983), concluded that one of the few things that writers agreed on in evaluation

literature is the need to have multiple sources of information on an individual faculty member's effectiveness. He indicated that teaching is a complex and difficult process that cannot be evaluated on the basis of any one source of information such as the results from a classroom observation, student evaluations and peer comments. In the difficult process of evaluation, most professionals feel they are better able to document their effectiveness when a combination of self-evaluation and outside evaluation sources are combined (Turgeon, 1983).

The successful evaluation of teaching effectiveness must be a cooperative effort involving all participants in the teaching-learning process; the individual instructor, students, peers, and administrative and supervisory personnel. It is not something done to an instructor by someone else. In this context, the evaluation of teaching effectiveness is a self-management responsibility. Data used to evaluate teaching effectiveness acquires validity and reliability in relation to the specific purposes of instruction and the specific instructional setting being evaluated. Specificity and variability of purposes and settings are essential concepts to be considered in developing procedures for evaluating teaching effectiveness (Stone, 1976).

The Review of Related Literature provided the basis for the selection of the variables used in determining the hypotheses for this study. The results of the previous

studies indicated that student evaluations, department chairmen evaluations, student grades and student attrition were the most frequently used variables to compare the effectiveness of instruction by full-time and adjunct faculty.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This project was designed to determine if the effectiveness of instruction presented by full-time faculty and adjunct faculty are comparable. To accomplish this, all of the full-time and adjunct faculty in the Business Division were used as a sample population. Fayetteville Technical Institute employed 165 full-time instructors during the Fall Quarter 1985. Thirty-seven full-time instructors, or twenty-two percent were assigned to the Business Division during the Fall Quarter 1985. Of the 182 adjunct faculty employed, forty-seven or twenty-six percent were assigned to the Business Division. The Business Division consists of fifteen different curricula and generally represents a cross section of the student and faculty population at Fayetteville Technical Institute (See Appendix D). Fifty-three percent of the classes in the Business Division were taught by full-time faculty members. Adjunct faculty members taught the remaining forty-seven percent of the business classes (See Appendix C).

Four comparative evaluative measures were used. These comparative areas are: (1) student evaluations; (2) Department Chairman evaluations; (3) grades of the students; and (4) attrition of students. Permission to utilize evaluations without disclosing the identity of the faculty

member was obtained. For the purpose of this study, each full-time and adjunct faculty member was assigned a reference number. This reference number was necessary to distinguish between the two groups and to provide a means of compiling the data obtained from the four evaluation measures.

Each quarter every faculty member has been evaluated by the students in one of his or her assigned classes. This evaluation was used as a partial comparative analysis of the instructor's effectiveness. In order to test the first hypothesis, The Student Evaluation of Instructor Questionnaire (See Appendix A) was the instrument used. The questionnaire is comprised of fifteen questions that are further broken down into four major evaluation areas of interest. Questions One through Five focus on teaching methods. Questions Six through Nine focus on instructor evaluation and testing methods. Questions Ten through Twelve refer to the instructor's attitudes toward the students and Questions Thirteen through Fifteen concern the administrative duties of the instructor.

To provide a numerical tabular presentation of the data obtained from the student evaluation questionnaires, a chi-square of the crossbreak construction in percentage form was used. The two variables for each question or group of questions on the evaluation forms were (1) full-time faculty and (2) adjunct faculty. The two subset partitions of the variables were (1) "YES" and (2) "NO" responses by the

students. Using this crossbreak construction, a means of determining the relationship between the two variables was possible. The crossbreak construction was used to organize the data obtained into a convenient form for statistical testing. The chi-square test at the .05 level of statistical significance was used.

To test the second hypothesis, an evaluation was conducted on each full-time and adjunct faculty member of the Business Division by the Program Chairperson, or the Department Chairman during the Fall Quarter 1985. This evaluation was conducted using the same form required for annual formal evaluations (See Appendix B).

The evaluations were again separated into two groups. Group A was the faculty evaluation of full-time instructors. Group B was the faculty evaluation of adjunct faculty members. To provide a numerical tabular presentation of data obtained from the chairman evaluations, a chi-square of a 2 x 3 crossbreak construction was used for the twelve criteria. The data were presented in percentage form. The two variables used for each criterion were (1) full-time faculty and (2) adjunct faculty. The three subset partitions of the variables were (1) Does not meet job requisites, (2) Partially meets job requisites, (3) Meets job requisites. These data were then tested using the chi-square test at the .05 level of significance.

Upon completion of the Fall Quarter 1985, the final grade reports of those classes evaluated were examined to

obtain the overall student grades and student attrition. These were separated into classes taught by full-time faculty and those taught by adjunct faculty.

To test the third hypothesis, the overall student grades were compared. Using the student grades as one segment of the total evaluation, the variance of the two groups was calculated. To statistically analyze the variance, an independent t-test was applied. This provided the information necessary to determine if there was a statistical difference in the means of the average of student grades of the two groups, (1) students taught by full-time faculty, and (2) students taught by adjunct faculty.

To test the fourth hypothesis, the overall student attrition was compared. A chi-square of a two variable crossbreak construction in percentage form was used to compare the difference of attrition of students receiving instruction from full-time and adjunct faculty. The two variables were (1) full-time faculty and (2) adjunct faculty. The two subsets were (1) those students that started one of the evaluated courses of instruction and stayed until completion (retention) and (2) those students that started an evaluated course of instruction and withdrew prior to course completion (attrition). After the relationship of the two groups was established, the data were statistically tested at the .05 level of significance.

The four tested hypotheses were designed to determine if there were significant differences in the effectiveness of full-time and adjunct faculty in the Business Division at Fayetteville Technical Institute. The data from the chi-square of the crossbreak constructions and the t-test of independent means were compared to give an overall picture of the results.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the investigation of the research question and its four hypotheses. Numerical data are presented in tabular form with explanations and definitions accompanying the presentation. The research question was as follows: Is there a difference in the effectiveness of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty in the Business Division at Fayetteville Technical Institute as measured by four procedures?

The first null hypothesis studied was: There is no significant difference in student evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty members. The Fayetteville Technical Institute Student Evaluation of Instructors (Appendix A) was completed by the students assigned to one of the classes taught by each of the thirty-seven full-time faculty members and the forty-seven adjunct faculty members employed in the Business Division. A total of 1502 evaluations were used in this study. This total consisted of 703 evaluations completed by students enrolled in classes taught by full-time instructors, and 799 evaluations completed by students enrolled in classes taught by adjunct faculty. Each of the fifteen questions on the evaluations, plus the four sub-division summaries were tested using the chi-square test at the .05 level of significance. A coefficient of

contingency (C) was used to provide a constructive index of the strength of the relationship between the two variables of full-time and adjunct faculty.

The table chi-square was used to determine if a statistical significance existed at the .05 level of significance using one degree of freedom. The table value was 3.841. When the observed values exceed this level of significance the chi-square test reflects a statistically significant difference between the two variables that was not due to chance. The computed chi-square value must equal or exceed the appropriate chi-square table critical value to justify rejection of the null hypothesis or the assumption of independence at the .05 level of significance. The chi-square test applies only to discrete values. The test is a test of independence; the idea that one variable is not affected by, or related to, another variable. The chi-square is not a measure of the degree of relationship, it is merely used to estimate the likelihood that some other factor other than chance accounts for the apparent relationship.

Chi-square tells nothing about the magnitude of the association or relation between catagorical variables. The coefficient of contingency, however, is one means of indexing the strength or magnitude of the association or relation between categorical variables. The coefficient of contingency is sometimes considered to be inadequate because it cannot reach 1.00, has no signs and is not readily

interpretable in various terms. Nevertheless, it does yield a measure of association that is useful if used with circumspection.

An analysis of the chi-square data shown in Table 1 indicated that very strong statistical differences occured between how students evaluated full-time and adjunct faculty in Question One. The chi-square and percentages reflected that full-time faculty were more knowledgeable in their subject content area than adjunct faculty.

Table 1

Is Generally Knowledgeable of Content Area

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	703	100.0	0	0.0				
799					759	95.0	40	5.0

Chi-Square=36.157 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.153

An analysis of the chi-square data shown in Table 2 indicated a significant difference existed between how students evaluated the full-time and adjunct faculty on Question Two. The data indicated that the full-time faculty make better formal classroom presentation of material.

Table 2

Is Interesting in Presentation of the Material

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	685	97.4	18	2.6				
799					667	83.5	132	16.5

Chi-Square=81.075 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.226

Table 3

Makes Course Objectives Clear

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	664	94.4	39	5.5				
799					744	93.1	55	6.9

Chi-Square= 1.138 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.028

An analysis of the chi-square data shown in Table 3 indicated that there was no significant statistical difference between how the students evaluated full-time and

adjunct faculty members on Question Three. Both groups made their course objectives clear.

An analysis of the chi-square data shown in Table 4 reflected no statistical difference between how students evaluated full-time and adjunct faculty on Question Four. Both groups were similarly rated as to how they followed the stated objectives when presenting material.

Table 4

Follows Stated Objectives in Presentation of the Material

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	680	96.7	23	3.3				
799					759	95.0	40	5.0

Chi-Square= 2.799 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.043

The analysis of the chi-square data presented in Table 5 reflected no significant statistical difference between how the students evaluated full-time and adjunct faculty members on Question Five. It was evident that both groups gave clear assignments to their students.

Table 5

Makes Clear Assignments

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	685	97.4	18	2.6				
799					768	96.1	31	3.9

Chi-Square= 2.063 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.037

Table 6

Student Responses for Teaching Methods
Questions 1 Through 5

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
3515	3417	97.2	98	2.8				
3995					3697	92.5	298	5.3

Chi-Square=81.685 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.227

Table 6 is a summation of the first five tables and rated full-time and adjunct faculty members on their overall

teaching methods as evaluated by the students. An analysis of the chi-square data presented in Table 6 indicated a significant statistical difference occured between full-time and adjunct faculty members in their teaching methods. The full-time faculty possessed a stronger knowledge of teaching methods.

A closer look at the percentages of the responses to each question reveals a slightly different picture. Tables 1 through 6 were questions to identify the effectiveness of the teaching methods of the full-time and adjunct faculty as seen by the students. Table 7 is a consolidation of the totals of these Tables.

Table 7

Consolidation of Tables Used to Determine the Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty Ratings for Overall Teaching Methods

	YES				NO				
TABLE	F/T		ADJ		F/T		ADJ		CHI
NUMBER	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	SQUARE
1.	703	100.0	759	95.0	0	0.0	40	5.0	36.157
2.	685	97.4	667	83.5	18	2.6	132	16.5	81.075
3.	664	94.4	667	93.1	39	5.5	55	6.9	1.138
4.	680	96.7	759	95.0	23	3.3	40	5.0	2.799
5.	685	97.4	768	96.1	18	2.6	31	3.9	2.063
6.	3417	97.2	3697	92.5	98	2.8	298	7.5	81.685

The results summarized in Table 6 indicate the students supported the teaching methods of the full-time

faculty over those teaching methods of the adjunct faculty. In actuality, there were significant differences in Tables 1 and 2, but little or no difference was evident in the percentages shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5. The significant ratings on Question One, Table 1 concerning Instructor's General Knowledge, and Question Two, Table 2, on Instructor's Presentation overshadowed the entire section and significantly influenced the statistical results.

The next four questions were directed toward the faculty member's overall ability in evaluation methods. The results of the instructor's evaluation methods are presented in Table 12, which follows the tables of individual question analysis.

Table 8

Tells Students How They Will Be Tested and Graded

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	689	98.0	14	2.0				
799					788	98.7	11	1.3

Chi-Square= .863 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.024

An analysis of the chi-square data shown in Table 8 indicated that there was no significant statistical difference between how the full-time and adjunct faculty were evaluated by the students on Question Six. Both groups were rated similarly as to how they told the students they would be tested and graded.

An analysis of the chi-square data shown on Table 9 indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in student responses to Question Seven. The full-time faculty were rated higher on giving tests on material covered than were the adjunct faculty.

Table 9

Gives Tests on the Material Covered

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	684	97.3	19	2.7				
799					754	94.4	45	5.6

Chi-Square= 7.866 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.072

An analysis of the chi-square data shown on Table 10 reflected no statistical significant differences in student responses to Question Eight. Full-time and adjunct faculty were rated similarly on the time required to return written

assignments and tests after being graded by the instructor.

Table 10

Returns Papers and Tests Within a Reasonable Time According to Type and Length of Paper or Test and Class Size

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	695	98.9	8	1.1				
799					782	97.9	17	2.1

Chi-Square= 2.238 alpha=3.841 <.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.039

Table 11

Provides Enough Tests, Projects, and Written Assignments that are Sufficient to Evaluate the Work Done

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	655	93.2	48	6.8				
799					742	92.9	57	7.1

Chi-Square= .053 alpha=3.841 <.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.006

An analysis of the chi-square data shown on Table 11 expressed no statistically significant difference between student evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty on Question Nine. It is clear that both groups provided enough tests, projects and assignments to adequately evaluate the work completed.

Table 12

Student Responses for Evaluation Methods
Questions 6 Through 9

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2812	2723	96.8	89	3.2				
3196					3066	95.9	219	3.6

Chi-Square= 3.470 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.048

Table 12 summarized student responses to Questions Six through Nine. The analysis of the chi-square data shown on Table 12 presented no significant statistical difference in the overall evaluative measures used by full-time and adjunct faculty. The only question reflecting a significant difference was in response to Question Seven, Table 9, testing on material covered. The statistical difference was

not great enough to influence the overall evaluation methods in favor of full-time faculty.

Table 12 reflected no significant difference between the two groups in their overall evaluative measures. A comparison of these questions is shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Consolidation of Tables Used to Determine the Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty Ratings for Overall Evaluation Methods

	YES				NO				
TABLE NUMBER	F/T N	F/T %	ADJ N	ADJ %	F/T N	F/T %	ADJ N	ADJ %	CHI SQUARE
8.	689	98.0	788	98.7	14	2.0	11	1.3	0.863
9.	684	97.3	754	94.4	19	2.7	45	5.6	7.866
10.	695	98.9	782	97.9	8	1.1	17	2.1	2.238
11.	655	93.2	742	92.9	48	6.8	57	7.1	0.053
12.	2723	96.8	3066	95.9	89	3.2	130	4.1	3.470

The next three questions were directed toward how the students evaluated the faculty member's overall attitude in the classroom. The composite results are found in Table 17. This table follows the tables of individual question analysis.

The analysis of the chi-square data presented in Table 14 disclosed no significant statistical difference in student evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty on Question Ten. Both groups maintained availablity for

student conferences during scheduled office hours and by appointment.

Table 14

Is Available for Student Conferences During Scheduled Office Hours or by Appointment

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	687	97.7	16	2.3				
799					780	97.6	19	2.4

Chi-Square= .017 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.003

Table 15

Is Concerned with Student Progress

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	685	97.4	18	2.6				
799					775	97.0	24	3.0

Chi-Square= .270 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.013

An analysis of the chi-square data shown on Table 15 expressed no statistically significant difference between student evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty on Question Eleven. It was apparent that both groups were concerned with student progress.

The analysis of the chi-square data shown on Table 16 indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in student responses to Question Twelve. The adjunct faculty were rated higher on encouragement of classroom participation of the students.

Table 16

Encourages Classroom Participation of the Student

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	666	94.7	37	5.3				
799					781	97.7	18	2.3

Chi-Square= 9.607 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.079

Table 17 summarized the student responses to Questions Ten through Twelve. The analysis of the chi-square data shown on Table 17 presented no significant statistical difference in the overall attitudes of

instructors. Table 18 is a consolidation of these results.

Table 17

Student Responses for Instructor Attitudes
Questions 10 Through 12

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2109	2038	96.6	71	3.4				
2397					2336	97.1	61	2.9

Chi-Square= 2.664 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.024

Table 18

Consolidation of Tables Used to Determine the
Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty Ratings
for Overall Attitudes of Instructors

TABLE NUMBER	YES F/T N	YES F/T %	YES ADJ N	YES ADJ %	NO F/T N	NO F/T %	NO ADJ N	NO ADJ %	CHI SQUARE
14.	687	97.7	780	97.6	16	2.3	19	2.4	0.017
15.	685	97.4	775	97.0	18	2.6	24	3.0	0.270
16.	666	94.7	781	97.7	37	5.3	18	2.3	9.607
17.	2038	96.6	2336	97.1	71	3.4	61	2.5	2.664

Question Twelve, Table 16 reflected a significant difference favoring adjunct faculty's ability to encourage

classroom participation. This difference, however, was not large enough to sway the overall student evaluation of instructor attitudes.

The next three questions were directed toward the instructor's ability to adhere to administrative responsibilities in the classroom. The composite results are found in Table 21. This table follows the individual question analysis tables.

Table 19

Generally Begins Class on Scheduled Time

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	681	96.9	22	3.1				
799					737	92.2	62	7.8

Chi-Square=15.185 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.100

The analysis of the chi-square data presented in Table 19 revealed a statistically significant difference in student responses to Question Thirteen. The full-time faculty member was rated much higher on starting classes on time.

Table 20

Remains in Classroom, Lab, or Shop
During Class Period

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	703	100.0	0	0.0				
799					795	99.5	4	9.5

Chi-Square= 3.529 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.048

An analysis of the chi-square data shown on Table 20 pointed out that there was no significant statistical difference between full-time and adjunct faculty as evaluated by the students on Question Fourteen. The number of "NO" responses was so small that both groups appeared to be very conscientious about remaining in their classroom, lab or shop during the class period.

An analysis of the chi-square data presented in Table 21 indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the student responses to Question Fifteen. Both full-time and adjunct faculty were rated similarly by the students on their ability to release classes on time.

Table 21

Generally Releases Class on Scheduled Time

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
703	698	99.3	5	0.7				
799					791	99.	8	1.0

Chi-Square= .367 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.027

Table 22

Student Responses for Classroom
Administrative Techniques
Questions 13 Through 15

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2109	2082	98.7	27	1.3				
2397					2323	96.9	74	3.1

Chi-Square=16.717 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.105

Table 22 summarized the student responses to Questions Thirteen through Fifteen. The analysis of the

chi-square data shown on Table 22 presented a significant statistical difference in the overall classroom administrative duties of the instructor. The full-time faculty were rated higher in their overall administrative duties.

Table 23

Consolidation of Tables Used to Determine the Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty Ratings for Overall Classroom Administrative Duties

	YES				NO				
TABLE	F/T		ADJ		F/T		ADJ		CHI
NUMBER	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	SQUARE
19	681	96.9	737	92.2	22	3.1	62	7.8	15.185
20.	703	100.0	795	99.5	0	0.0	4	0.5	3.529
21.	698	99.3	791	99.0	5	0.7	8	1.0	0.367
22.	2082	98.7	2323	96.9	27	1.3	74	3.1	16.717

Table 23 revealed that the responses by the student to Question Thirteen, Table 19, skewed the overall responses shown in Table 22. Instructors overall administrative techniques were in favor of the full-time faculty member.

Table 24 summarized the student responses to the entire evaluation. The analysis of the chi-square data presented in Table 24 indicated a significant statistical difference in the overall student evaluation of full-time and adjunct faculty. The students rated the full-time faculty higher throughout the questionnaire. This

significant difference provided the data necessary to reject the first null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis of: there is a significant difference in the student evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty members.

Table 24

Overall Student Evaluation Responses

Student Responses	Full-Time Faculty				Adjunct Faculty			
	YES		NO		YES		NO	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
10545	10260	97.3	285	2.7				
11985					11422	95.3	563	4.7

Chi-Square=61.626 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.199

The second null hypothesis studied was: There is no significant difference in the Department Chairman evaluation of full-time and adjunct faculty. The Fayetteville Technical Institute Faculty Evaluation of Instructors (Appendix B) was completed by the Department Chairman on all thirty-seven full-time faculty members and all forty-seven adjunct faculty members assigned to the Business Division in the Fall Quarter 1985. A total of eighty-four evaluations were used in this study. The evaluation consisted of twelve

criteria that were tested using the chi-square test at the .05 level of significance. The table value chi-square used to determine if a statistical significance existed at the .05 level of significance using two degrees of freedom was 5.991. When the observed values exceed this level of significance the chi-square test reflects a statistically significant difference between the two variables that was not due to chance.

Table 25

Exhibits Responsible Implementation of All Policies and Procedures of the College

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total Business Faculty	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Meets Job Requisites	29	78.4	25	53.2	54	64.3
Partially Meets Job Requisites	6	16.2	18	38.3	24	28.6
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	2	5.4	4	8.5	6	7.1

Chi-Square= 5.855 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.255

An analysis of the chi-square data shown in Table 25 reflected no significant statistical difference in Department Chairman evaluation of full-time and adjunct faculty on Criterion One. Both groups exhibited responsible

implementation of all policies and procedures of the college. It should be noted that the chi-square statistics in Table 25 reflected no significant difference, however, two full-time and four adjunct faculty members were rated as not meeting job requisites. This equates to seven percent of those employed in the Business Division on this criterion.

Table 26

Anticipates Equipment, Textbook, and Supply Needs

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total Business Faculty	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Meets Job Requisites	28	75.7	35	74.4	63	75.0
Partially Meets Job Requisites	6	16.2	9	19.3	15	17.9
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	3	8.1	3	6.3	6	7.1

Chi-Square= .189 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.047

The analysis of the chi-square data presented for Table 26 showed no statistically significant difference in the Department Chairman evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty on Criterion Two. Both groups anticipated their equipment, supply and textbook needs. However, three full-time and three adjunct faculty members failed to meet

job requisites for this criterion. This equates to seven percent.

Table 27

Shows Proper Concern for the Care, Maintenance, and Security of Equipment in the Classroom, Laboratory, Shop

	Full-Time Faculty N	%	Adjunct Faculty N	%	Total Business Faculty N	%
Meets Job Requisites	26	70.3	32	68.4	58	69.0
Partially Meets Job Requisites	7	18.9	12	25.5	19	22.6
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	4	10.8	3	6.4	7	8.4

Chi-Square= .902 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.103

The analysis of the chi-square data shown for Table 27 indicated no significant statistical difference for the evaluation of Department Chairman for Criterion Three. The majority of both groups exercised proper concern for the care, maintenance, and security of equipment in the classroom. Of the full-time faculty, four failed to meet the job requisites. Three adjunct faculty also failed to meet job requisites. This equates to over eight percent.

Table 28

Promptly Submits Reports, Grades, Et Cetera

	Full-Time Faculty N	%	Adjunct Faculty N	%	Total Business Faculty N	%
Meets Job Requisites	35	94.6	46	97.9	81	96.4
Partially Meets Job Requisites	2	5.4	1	2.1	3	3.6
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Chi-Square= .646 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.087

The analysis of the chi-square data presented in Table 28 indicated there was no significant statistical difference in the Department Chairman evaluation of Criterion Four. Both groups were prompt in submitting reports, grades and other administrative requirements. All faculty partially met, or met job requisites for this criterion.

An analysis of the chi-square of the data presented for Table 29 showed no significant statistical difference in the evaluation of full-time and adjunct faculty in Criterion Five. Both groups maintained a cooperative attitude in the performance of their duties and stayed current in their

discipline areas. Four full-time faculty and one adjunct faculty member failed to meet job requisites for this criterion. This equates to six percent of the total faculty employed in the Business Division.

Table 29

Exhibits a Cooperative Attitude in the Performance of All Responsibilities. Keeps Abreast of Changes within His or Her Discipline

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total Business Faculty	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Meets Job Requisites	32	86.5	41	87.2	73	86.9
Partially Meets Job Requisites	1	2.7	5	10.6	6	7.1
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	4	10.8	1	2.2	5	6.0

Chi-Square= 4.448 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.224

An analysis of the chi-square data for Table 30 indicated a statistically significant difference in the Department Chairman evaluation for Criterion Six. This job criterion included: "Meets classes regularly and punctually. Makes course objectives clear, informs students of criteria for testing and grading. Teaches and tests to meet objectives. Has knowledge of subject matter and uses

time well." Over twenty-four percent of the full-time faculty were evaluated as not meeting job requisites in contrast to all adjunct faculty members either partially meeting or meeting job requisites.

Table 30

Meets Classes Regularly and Punctually. Makes Course Objectives Clear, Informs Students of Criteria for Testing and Grading. Teaches and Tests to Meet Objectives

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total Business Faculty	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Meets Job Requisites	21	56.8	40	85.1	61	72.6
Partially Meets Job Requisites	7	18.9	7	14.9	14	16.7
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	9	24.3	0	0.0	9	10.7

Chi-Square=13.925 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.377

The analysis of chi-square data shown on Table 31 expressed a statistically significant difference between the evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty by the Department Chairman for Criterion Seven. This criterion included: "Appropriate use of instructional aids such as films, overhead projectors, maps, charts, audio tapes, et cetera, giving consideration to subject matter and the

Table 31

Appropriate Use of Instructional Aids

	Full-Time Faculty N	%	Adjunct Faculty N	%	Total Business Faculty N	%
Meets Job Requisites	30	81.1	25	53.2	55	65.5
Partially Meets Job Requisites	6	16.2	15	31.9	21	25.0
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	1	2.7	7	14.9	8	9.5

Chi-Square= 7.731 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.290

Table 32

Evaluates Courses and Tries to Improve Them

	Full-Time Faculty N	%	Adjunct Faculty N	%	Total Business Faculty N	%
Meets Job Requisites	18	48.6	20	42.6	38	45.2
Partially Meets Job Requisites	16	43.2	18	38.3	34	40.5
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	3	8.2	9	19.1	12	14.3

Chi-Square= 2.062 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.155

learning needs of the students." Seven adjunct faculty and one full-time faculty member failed to meet job requisites for this criterion.

The analysis of the chi-square data presented on Table 32 showed no significant statistical difference in the evaluation of either group for Criterion Eight. Three full-time faculty and nine adjunct faculty were rated as failing to meet job requisites for evaluating the course of instruction or trying to improve the course.

Table 33

Available to Students for Out-of-Classroom Instruction and Advising

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total Business Faculty	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Meets Job Requisites	31	83.8	28	59.6	59	70.2
Partially Meets Job Requisites	5	13.5	12	25.5	17	20.3
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	1	2.7	7	14.9	8	9.5

Chi-Square= 6.436 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.267

The analysis of the chi-square of the data shown for Table 33 indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the Department Chairman evaluation

of full-time and adjunct faculty for Criterion Nine. This criterion concerned the availability of the faculty member to students for out-of-classroom instruction and advising. Seven adjunct faculty and one full-time faculty were rated as not meeting job requisites for this criterion.

Table 34

Fulfills Role in Departmental Duties

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total Business Faculty	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Meets Job Requisites	29	78.4	2	4.3	31	36.9
Partially Meets Job Requisites	6	16.2	12	25.5	18	21.4
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	2	5.4	33	70.2	35	41.7

Chi-Square=52.527 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.620

The analysis of the chi-square data presented in Table 34 indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty by the Department Chairman for Criterion Ten. The criterion stated, "Fulfills role in departmental duties as it relates to faculty meetings, advisory responsibilities, meetings as scheduled, attending and

adhering to institutional faculty workday policy."

Thirty-three adjunct faculty were rated as not meeting job requisites. Two full-time faculty were rated as not meeting job requisites.

Table 35

Participates in Professional Development Programs

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total Business Faculty	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Meets Job Requisites	30	81.1	44	93.6	74	88.1
Partially Meets Job Requisites	5	13.5	3	6.4	8	9.5
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	2	5.4	0	0.0	2	2.4

Chi-Square= 4.015 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.213

The analysis of the chi-square data shown on Table 35 indicated that there was no significant statistical difference for Criterion Eleven. This criterion covered the area of professional development. Areas covered in this area included: active in professional associations and works willingly on appointed committees of the college. Two full-time faculty failed to meet this job requisite, but all adjunct faculty either partially met, or met this criterion.

Table 36

Adheres to Dress Requirements

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total Business Faculty	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Meets Job Requisites	20	54.1	42	89.4	62	73.8
Partially Meets Job Requisites	17	45.9	5	10.6	22	26.2
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Chi-Square=13.351 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.370

The analysis of the chi-square for the data shown on Table 36 indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in meeting Criterion Twelve. Forty-two of the forty-seven adjunct faculty met the job requisites in adhering to dress requirements, the remaining five adjunct faculty partially met this job requisite. Only twenty of the full-time faculty were rated as meeting job requisites. The remaining seventeen full-time faculty partially met the job requisites.

The analysis of the chi-square data shown in Table 37 expressed a significant statistical difference between the full-time and adjunct faculty as rated by the Department

Chairman. Of the total ratings on all criteria, seven percent of the full-time faculty and almost twelve percent of the adjunct faculty were rated as not meeting job requisites.

Table 37

Overall Department Chairman Evaluation Responses
Criteria 1 Through 12

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total Business Faculty	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Meets Job Requisites	329	74.1	308	67.4	709	70.3
Partially Meets Job Requisites	84	18.9	117	20.7	201	19.9
Does Not Meet Job Requisites	31	7.0	67	11.9	98	9.8
Totals	444		564		1008	

Chi-Square= 8.141 alpha=5.991 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.089

Table 38 is a consolidation of the information found in Tables 25 through 36 in percentage form. The numbers 1 through 12 correspond to the criterion listed on the Faculty Evaluation form (Appendix B) and are used in the title descriptions found in Tables 25 through 36.

Table 38

A Comparison of Percentages of Department Chairman Evaluations of Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty

Criterion		Job Requisites in Percents		
		Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet
1.	Full-Time	78.4	16.2	5.4
	Adjunct	53.2	38.3	8.5
2.	Full-Time	75.7	16.2	8.1
	Adjunct	74.4	19.3	6.3
3.	Full-Time	70.3	18.9	10.8
	Adjunct	68.1	25.5	6.4
4.	Full-Time	94.6	5.4	0.0
	Adjunct	97.9	2.1	0.0
5.	Full-Time	86.5	2.7	10.8
	Adjunct	87.2	10.6	2.2
6.	Full-Time	56.8	18.9	24.3
	Adjunct	85.1	14.9	0.0
7.	Full-Time	81.1	16.2	2.7
	Adjunct	53.2	31.9	14.9
8.	Full-Time	48.6	43.2	8.2
	Adjunct	42.6	38.3	19.1
9.	Full-Time	83.8	13.5	2.7
	Adjunct	59.6	25.5	14.9
10.	Full-Time	78.4	16.2	5.4
	Adjunct	4.3	25.5	70.2
11.	Full-Time	81.1	13.5	5.4
	Adjunct	93.6	6.4	0.0
12.	Full-Time	54.1	45.9	0.0
	Adjunct	89.4	10.6	0.0

The overall ratings were in favor of the full-time faculty that provided the necessary support to reject the null hypothesis. The alternate hypothesis: There is a significant difference in the Department Chairman evaluation of full-time and adjunct faculty, was accepted.

The third null-hypothesis studied was: There is no significant difference between the grades of students receiving instruction from full-time faculty and adjunct faculty. A review of the official rosters disclosed that 1738 seats were filled in the evaluated classes of the Business Division at the beginning of the Fall Quarter 1985 at Fayetteville Technical Institute. At the conclusion of the Fall Quarter there were 1502 students remaining in the evaluated classes who received grades. The students completing the courses of instruction were divided into two groups. Those groups were: 703 students receiving instruction from full-time faculty members; and 799 students receiving instruction from adjunct faculty members.

The analysis of the t-test for independent samples is shown in Table 39. The table includes the data used to determine the difference in the average of student grades.

Both groups had a grade range from 4.0 (A) to 0.0 (Failing). Plus and minus grades are not used. Grades are computed on a seven point scale. The mean average of grades of students receiving instruction from adjunct faculty was slightly higher than those receiving instruction from full-time faculty.

Table 39

Independent Sample Background for Average of Student Grades

	Full-Time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Totals
Number of Students at Start of Quarter	796	942	1738
Number of Students that Withdrew During Quarter	93	143	236
Number of Students Completing Course	703	799	1502
Highest Grade	4.0	4.0	
Lowest Grade	0.0	0.0	
degrees of freedom df			1500
Mean Average of Grades	2.1124	2.4355	
Standard Deviation	1.1087	1.0096	
Calculated t Value			1.599
Critical Value of t at the .05 Level of Significance			1.645

The .05 level of significance was selected to determine the difference between two independent samples. The critical value of t equaled 1.645 which was greater than the calculated value of t of 1.599. The calculated value of t was less than the critical value of t at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis: There is no significant

difference between the grades of students receiving instruction from full-time faculty and adjunct faculty, was accepted.

Statistically there was no significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level of significance. Table 40 reflects the number and percentage of grades given by full-time and adjunct faculty. The mean average of student grades were 2.1 for full-time faculty and 2.4 for adjunct faculty, however, the grade distribution reflected additional differences.

Table 40

A Comparison of Letter Grades Received by the Student Population Taught by Full-time and Adjunct Faculty in the Business Division

Student Grade Distribution

	Full-Time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Total	
Grade	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	84	11.9	118	14.8	202	13.7
B	142	20.2	264	33.0	406	27.0
C	328	46.7	304	38.0	632	42.2
D	67	9.5	74	9.3	141	9.4
FAIL	82	11.7	39	4.9	121	8.1
Totals	703		799		1502	

Chi-Square=53.003 alpha=9.488 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.034

The analysis of the chi-square data presented on Table 40 indicated a statistical significant difference between the full-time and adjunct faculty grade distribution. At the .05 level of significance for 4 degrees of freedom, the table level of chi-square is 9.488. The observed chi-square was 53.003. The overall rating showed that the adjunct faculty significantly gave a greater number of grades "C" and above than did the full-time faculty.

The fourth null hypothesis studied was: There is no significant difference in the attrition of students receiving instruction from full-time faculty and adjunct faculty. The results of the review of the official rosters disclosed that 1738 seats were filled in the evaluated classes of the Business Division at the beginning of the Fall Quarter, 1985. At the conclusion of the quarter, 1502 seats were filled.

The analysis of the chi-square data presented on Table 41 expressed a statistically significant difference between the attrition of students receiving instruction from full-time faculty and students receiving instruction from adjunct faculty. At the .05 level of significance at one degree of freedom, the table level of chi-square is 3.841. The observed chi-square was 4.278.

Table 41

Attrition/Retention of Students

	Attrition N	Attrition %	Retention N	Retention %	Total N
Full-Time Faculty	93	11.7	703	88.3	796
Adjunct Faculty	142	15.1	799	84.9	942
Totals	235	13.5	1502	86.5	1738

Chi-Square=4.278 alpha=3.841 (.05
Coefficient of Contingency Relationship=.049

The overall rating showed that the full-time faculty retained a greater percentage of students during the Fall Quarter than did the adjunct faculty members, therefore, the student attrition was greater for the adjunct faculty. With these results the null hypothesis was rejected. The alternate hypothesis: There is a significant difference in the attrition of students receiving instruction of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty, was accepted.

Chapter 5

INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Interpretation of Results

The following subsections on the interpretation of results are separated into four parts, one for each hypothesis. The Tables referring to the results are found in the preceding chapter.

Null Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference in the student evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty members.

An overall chi-square statistical interpretation of the results disclosed that the full-time faculty were rated above the adjunct faculty on the student evaluations. The statistical difference caused the rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the alternate hypothesis of: There is a significant difference in the student evaluations of full-time and adjunct faculty members.

A closer look at the percentages of the responses to each question reveals a slightly different picture. Tables 1 through 6 were questions to identify the effectiveness of the teaching methods of the full-time and adjunct faculty as seen by the students.

Table 6 statistically awarded the most effective teaching methods to the full-time faculty. In actuality, there were significant differences in Tables 1 and 2, but little or no difference was evident in the percentages shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5. The significant ratings in Table 1 on Instructor's General Knowledge, and Table 2, on Instructor's Presentation overshadowed the entire section and significantly influenced the statistical results.

Full-time faculty have been trained in the art of platform presentation, and are experienced in presenting material using a variety of media. Adjunct faculty normally come from a professional atmosphere where "time is money" and presentations are short and factual. Thus, their presentations are frequently perceived as dry, or boring.

Tables 8 through 11 reflect the student responses to the questions used in determining the effectiveness of the overall evaluation methods of full-time and adjunct faculty. With the exception of Table 9, none of the questions provided any significant difference between the two groups. Table 9 indicated that some of the adjunct faculty were preparing tests and other evaluative measures based on material not covered in the course being taught. This, in part, can be explained by the lack of orientation given adjunct faculty members. When considering the number of respondents, less than six percent perceived that the material was not covered in the course of instruction, it is difficult to say that this significance is meaningful.

Tables 14 through 17 summarized the responses to the questions designed to measure the overall attitudes of the instructor as perceived by the student. Overall there was no significant difference between the two groups. However, Table 16, which dealt with the encouragement of classroom participation by students reflected that some full-time faculty discouraged student participation in the classroom. The consolidation of student responses to the overall attitudes of the instructors is found in Table 18.

The administrative duties of full-time and adjunct faculty in the classroom displayed in Tables 19 through 21 showed there was a significant difference between the two groups. Sixty-two students rated the adjunct faculty members as not beginning class on time. This high number skewed the results of the block of questions in favor of the full-time faculty. Considering most adjunct faculty members are full-time employees for someone else, it is feasible to encounter last minute commitments that preclude them from arriving at school on time. Full-time faculty have offices and classes on campus, with bells to warn them of class starting times. Table 23 shows a consolidation of responses to questions concerning the administrative duties of instructors.

Using student ratings as one means of evaluating the overall effectiveness of instruction is beneficial. With the exception of Question Two the adjunct faculty were rated ninety-two percent or higher. In all ratings except for

Questions One, Two, and Thirteen, the difference between the two groups was less than three percent. Question One had a five percent difference, Question Two had almost a fourteen percent difference and Question Thirteen had a four and one/half percent difference. It is evident from these results that more emphasis must be made toward assisting the adjunct faculty in making their classroom presentations more interesting. In-service training can provide them with suggestions of different available methods of transfering information to the students.

It is significant for the adminsistration to review the punctuality of both adjunct and full-time faculty. Eighty-four student responses, or almost six percent, of all full-time and adjunct faculty evaluated were rated as not always starting their classes on time. When considering that one of the major reasons for using adjunct faculty is to save money, it is apparent that money is being lost through tardiness by both groups.

Null Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference in the Department Chairman evaluation of full-time and adjunct faculty.

Based on the statistically significant differences between full-time and adjunct faculty it is necessary to accept the alternate hypothesis on the overall evaluations by Department Chairman. Unlike the student evaluations, the Department Chairman presented a wider spread between the two

groups. The instrument used was designed to evaluate full-time faculty, and thus some of the questions were discriminatory against the adjunct faculty. The instrument was used at the request of the Dean of Instruction.

Due to the differences between the Department Chairman evaluations this hypothesis will be discussed based upon the instructor either meeting the criterion or failing to meet the criterion. To accomplish this, the percentages in the "Does Not Meet Job Requisites" column were compared. Criterion 1 through 12 correspond to the criterion listed on the Faculty Evaluation form (Appendix B) and are used in the title descriptions of the individual tables found in Chapter Four.

While Criterion One, Table 25 gave an overall lower rating to the adjunct faculty, based on a larger percentage partially meeting job requisites, there was not a statistically significant difference between the two groups. When exibiting the responsibility to implement all policies and procedures at the college, it should be noted that 5.4 percent of the full-time faculty and 8.5 percent of the adjunct faculty did not meet this criterion. The difference favored the full-time faculty.

Under Criterion Two, Table 26, statistically there was no significant difference. However, over eight percent of the full-time faculty, and over six percent of the adjunct faculty failed to meet the criterion to anticipate their equipment, textbooks and supply needs. The minor

difference between the groups favored the adjunct faculty..

Criterion Three, Table 27, indicated that almost eleven percent of the full-time faculty did not show proper concern for the care, maintenance and security of the equipment in the shops, labs and classrooms. Only six percent of the adjunct faculty were rated as not meeting this criterion. Statistically, however, there was no significant difference between the groups.

Criterion Four, Table 28, disclosed that all full-time and adjunct faculty either met or partially met the criterion for promptly submitting reports and grades. This is probably attributed to the pressure invoked by the administration for timely submission of these items.

In Table 29, Criterion Five there was no statistically significant difference between full-time and adjunct faculty in meeting the criteria for exhibiting a cooperative attitude in the performance of all responsibilites, and keeping abreast of changes within the discipline. It is interesting to note that almost eleven percent of the full-time faculty, compared to only two percent of the adjunct faculty failed to meet this job requisite. The difference favored adjunct faculty.

Criterion Six, Table 30 generally addressed many of the questions that comprise the student evaluation. Teaching methods, evaluation methods, and administrative duties are covered in this criterion. The results of this evaluation reflected that almost twenty-five percent of the

full-time faculty were rated as failing to meet this job requisite by the Department Chairman. All of the adjunct faculty were rated as meeting or partially meeting this job requisite. Because this criterion covers such a wide spectrum, it is difficult to determine why one/fourth of the full-time faculty did not meet job requisites. This criterion should be an area of major concern for the Department Chairman and the administration. The questions in the student evaluations, however, were more specific, and the lowest rating received by full-time faculty was ninety-three percent. The comparative results of the student and Department Chairman evaluations are not consistent.

Criterion Seven, Table 31, dealt with the appropriate use of instructional aids. Almost fifteen percent of the adjunct faculty and three percent of the full-time faculty failed to meet this requisite. It is probable that effective orientation on the availability and location of these media items would reduce this discrepency.

Criterion Eight, Table 32 addressed the issue of how the instructor evaluates courses and tries to improve them. Over nineteen percent of the adjunct faculty and eight percent of the full-time faculty failed to meet this job requisite. It is feasible to understand the high percentage of adjunct faculty that failed to meet this requisite, as adjunct faculty are not normally asked for this information. Having eight percent of the full-time faculty failing to

meet this job requisite should be a major concern for the Department Chairman and the administration. If the full-time faculty are not striving to improve class instruction and course content, they are doing an injustice to the student, the college and the community.

Criterion Nine, Table 33 discriminated against adjunct faculty. It focused on the availability of the instructor to the student for out-of-classroom instruction and advising. Almost fifteen percent of the adjunct faculty compared to three percent of the full-time faculty failed to meet this job requisite. No office space is provided for adjunct faculty, nor is additional pay provided for time spent above and beyond course contact hours. The eighty-five percent of adjunct faculty who met this requisite should be commended.

Criterion Ten, Table 34 is another discriminatory area for evaluation of adjunct faculty. It is understandable that almost sixty-five percent of the adjunct faculty failed to fulfill the roles in departmental duties as related to attending faculty meetings, advisory responsibilities, meetings as scheduled, and attending and adhering to institutional faculty workday policy. Only full-time faculty are assigned as advisors. Faculty meetings are conducted during regular workday hours, thus, adjunct faculty are normally precluded from participation. It should be of concern, however, that almost six percent of the full-time faculty are not meeting their responsibilities

in this area.

Criterion Eleven, Table 35 dealt with participation in professional development programs, active participation in professional associations and/or working willingly on appointed college committees. It is noteworthy and commendable that all adjunct faculty were participating in some form of professional development, whereas, over five percent of the full-time faculty did not meet this requisite. This can be attributed to a lack of available developmental programs, or to a lack of time or interest in participating on college committees.

Criterion Twelve, Table 36 dealt with the issue of adhering to dress requirements. While it is commendable that both groups met or partially met the requirements of this criterion, the ratings were significantly higher for adjunct faculty fully meeting this requirement. It should be noteworthy to the administration that almost fifty percent of full-time faculty only partially met the dress requirement.

Statistically, seven of the twelve criteria used by the Department Chairman to evaluate faculty showed no significant difference. Of the remaining five criteria, three favored full-time faculty and two favored adjunct faculty. The three criteria that favored full-time faculty, were identified as discriminatory against adjunct faculty.

Statistically the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternate hypothesis accepted. If the discriminatory

criteria were eliminated, there would be no significant statistical difference between the two groups.

Null Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference in the average of student grades of students receiving instruction from full-time and adjunct faculty.

Statistically, there was no significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was accepted. The letter grade distribution, Table 40 was constructed to show the number and percentage of grades given by full-time and adjunct faculty. Differences which were not evidenced by the statistical analysis emerged. Although the mean average of student grades for students taught by full-time faculty was 2.1 and the mean average for grades for students taught by adjunct faculty was 2.4, the grade distribution reflected some differences.

Most noteworthy was at the failure percentage. Although there were ninety-six more students in the adjunct faculty sample, the adjunct faculty failed forty-three fewer students in their classes. The grade of "B" or 3.0 was awarded to one hundred twenty-two more students by adjunct faculty than those assigned to full-time faculty.

Two factors which need to be considered when analyzing grades are transferability of credits and graduation requirements. When transfer of credits is a factor, the gaining institution normally requires a grade of

"C" or above to transfer the course. Most colleges require a 2.0 or "C" average upon completion of all course work in order for a student to graduate. Table 40 showed that over twenty-one percent of those students receiving instruction from full-time faculty could not transfer the course or meet the 2.0 "C" average requirement. Only fourteen percent of those graded by adjunct faculty failed to meet the standards to transfer the course or meet minimum graduation standards. The results of the grade distribution indicated that a difference does occur between the two groups. Adjunct faculty tend to grade higher than full-time faculty.

Null Hypothesis Four: There is no significant difference in the attrition of students receiving instruction from full-time faculty and adjunct faculty.

The rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the alternate hypothesis that there is a difference between the two groups is valid as shown in Table 41. There are several factors which might have influenced the results of this hypothesis.

Full-time faculty were previously rated as having a higher number of failures in their course of instruction, yet their retention of students exceeded the adjunct faculty by over three percent. This can partially be attributed to their availability to the students for consultation. Adjunct faculty are normally not available for student consultation that could preclude withdrawal. The higher

attrition of students from adjunct faculty classes might also be influenced by the time of day in which the student is enrolled in school. Part-time students withdraw from school more frequently because of interference from work and other outside activities. Adjunct faculty teach the preponderance of their course load to part-time students.

Adjunct faculty members will undoubtedly increase in numbers during the years ahead. They will be seen in increasing numbers in specialized areas of high technology and job skill areas where special skills are required. In order to assure effective instruction is being provided to the student, specific requirements will be necessary for successful adjunct faculty performance.

The results of this study indicate that there is little difference overall between the instruction provided by full-time faculty and that provided by adjunct faculty. Because adjunct faculty play an important role in the economic foundation of the college, it is beneficial for Fayetteville Technical Institute to provide the guidance and training necessary to develop a highly qualified instructional pool. Guidelines should be established that clearly define the role that adjunct faculty will play in the future of Fayetteville Technical Institute.

The results of this study echoed those of previous studies. Friedlander (1980), found that adjunct faculty did not have office space or other incentives to encourage them to meet students out of class or to provide students with

other instructional support. He indicated that full-time faculty were not totally supportive of professional organizations. He further stated that adjunct faculty were not aware of the clerical, media, and other support services available to them.

This study found the effectiveness of full-time and adjunct faculty were comparable. The studies conducted at Midwestern Community College (Cruise, Furst, and Klomes, 1980), Hagerstown Junior College (Parsons, 1983) and Elgin Community College (Willett, 1980), using similar variables, also reported no significant differences between these two groups.

Conclusions

The results of this study justify the following conclusions. Using student evaluations, Department Chairman evaluations, student grades and attrition of students as dependent measures, it was found that:

1. Overall, both full-time and adjunct faculty provide the student with a comparable education.

2. Full-time faculty provide better evaluative measures of student progress than do adjunct faculty.

3. Full-time faculty are available for out-of class consultation.

4. Full-time faculty and adjunct faculty need orientation on their responsibilities for implementing

school policies and procedures.

5. Care, maintenance and security of classrooms, shops and labs by full-time faculty needs to be addressed.

6. A large number of adjunct faculty are not aware of the availabity or use of audio-visual and other training aids.

7. Some full-time faculty are not meeting their responsibilities of improving class content or making recommendations for curriculum changes.

8. A large number of full-time faculty are not meeting their departmental responsibilities that include attendence at faculty meetings, adhering to institutional faculty workday policies, advisory responsibilities, or attending other meetings as required.

9. Full-time faculty are not adhering to nor fully supporting the institution's dress code.

10. The adjunct faculty grade higher and have a lower failure percentage than do full-time faculty members.

11. Attrition is higher among students of adjunct faculty.

Recommendations

On the basis of this study the following recommendations are made.

1. There is a need to revise the faculty evaluation instrument based on the findings of this study. Using the

faculty evaluation in conjunction with the student evaluation as part of the overall evaluation process indicates the two instruments are not comparable. The faculty evaluation was designed for the use of evaluating full-time faculty.

Since there is controversy between the evaluation instruments used to evaluate full-time and adjunct faculty, it appears that the present evaluation system is in need of revision. It is, therefore, recommended that using a formal and appropriate process that applies to both groups, a committee composed of students, faculty, Department Chairmen and administrators be appointed to appraise and revise the Faculty Evaluative Criteria and Student Evaluation instruments. An analysis of each item in both evaluative instruments should be undertaken to assess the effectiveness of each criterion for evaluating full-time and adjunct faculty members.

2. Currently there is a designated advisory committee at Fayetteville Technical Institute. It is recommended that this committee actively assist in developing, planning, coordinating and evaluating faculty development activities. The committee should be realigned to be an administrative/faculty advisory group composed of the Associate Dean of Instruction, six adjunct faculty representatives and a full-time faculty staff representative from each of the six major instructional areas of Fayetteville Technical Institute: (1) Business Division;

(2) Vocational Division; (3) Public Service Division; (4) Health Division; (5) Engineering Division; and (6) General Education Division. This committee should meet regularly to give direction to faculty in-service activities.

3. There is a recognized need to provide effective in-service developmental activities for full-time and adjunct faculty members. The faculty development that does exist has been provided primarily to full-time faculty. With the increase in use of adjunct faculty, it is evident that more attention be paid to professional development programs. Based on the findings of this study and the review of literature related to faculty development, the following broad recommendations are made. It is suggested that these recommendations form a philosophical base for the planning of a faculty development model that will benefit the full-time and adjunct faculty members and thus have a positive impact on Fayetteville Technical Institute.

(A) Within the administrative structure of Fayetteville Technical Institute, staff members should be designated who are responsible for carrying out regular faculty development activities. Faculty development activities should be accepted and incorporated as a necessary cost of instructional operations of Fayetteville Technical Institute.

(B) Plan and evaluate faculty development activities with the assistance of the internal advisory group. It is important that both the full-time and adjunct

faculty and the Department Chairmen give guidance to the planning, implementation and evaluation of faculty development activities. This advisory group should insure a close link between faculty needs for in-service activities and the instructional goals of Fayetteville Technical Institute. Additionally, this group should be responsible to identify internal resources for in-service activities. In this manner, Fayetteville Technical Institute can recognize and use its own resources, and only call on outside specialists for those services that cannot be provided from within.

(C) The in-service activities should be closely related to the goals of Fayetteville Technical Institute, rather than to the professional development plans of individual faculty members. It is important to involve adjunct faculty in the pursuit of Fayetteville Technical Institute's goals and the development of instructional activities. This type of participation should reduce the sense of isolation felt by adjunct faculty and strengthen the instructional programs of Fayetteville Technical Institute.

(D) Associate the faculty development plan directly with the evaluation of instruction. Through a non-punitive evaluation process, the needs for instructional improvement, identified in this study, can then be linked directly with appropriate faculty development activities. The in-service activities can be focused on the specific needs of

individuals and groups of faculty.

(E) Develop a communication system which provides a dialogue about teaching and learning. The results of this study indicate a need for a system that will provide a means of communication between and among full-time faculty, adjunct faculty and administration. This system should stimulate an open dialogue about teaching and learning with continuous feedback mechanisms to encourage all parties to communicate with each other about the issues and challenges related to teaching students at Fayetteville Technical Institute.

4. Improvement of orientation strategies is also recommended. Orientation for new faculty and adjunct faculty should be improved through the use of videotaped material to supplement and improve group and individual orientation sessions. The materials should focus on the unique differences of the community they will be serving. Additionally, the orientation should include proved teaching strategies related to teaching the different segments of the community. The orientation should also include procedures to be used in emergencies and the proper security and safeguarding of equipment and material in the classrooms, shops and laboratories.

Strategies for Diffusion, Implementation and Change

Copies of this Major Applied Research Project will be furnished to the Dean of Instruction, Associate Dean of Instruction, and Chairman of the Business Department. These three levels of institutional leadership can diseminate and use the findings of this study as desired. All three levels have already expressed an interest in the study and have agreed that any recommendations that will improve the overall effectiveness of the faculty will, if approved, by the responsible committees, administration and Board of Trustees, when applicable, implement the changes recommended.

Some of the recommendations for change can be implemented immediately with the approval of the Dean of Instruction. The findings will be presented to the full faculty quarterly meeting so they may provide additional feedback for the recommended changes and have a current understanding of how the measurement instruments were used.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armiger, Louise. "The Political Realitites of Teacher Evaluation." in Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills, London: Sage Publications, 1981.

Ary, Donald; Lucy C. Jacobs; and Asghar Razavieh. Introduction to Research in Education. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Behrendt, Richard L. and Michael H. Parsons. Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty. ERIC ED 335 633, 1983.

Best, John W. Research in Education. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Boggs, George. Evaluating and Developing Community College Faculty. ERIC ED 253 283, 1984.

Bridges, C. M.; W. B. Ware; B. B. Brown; and G. Greenwood. "Characteristics of Best and Worst College Teachers." Science Education, 55:545-553. October, 1971.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.

Carroll, J. "Faculty Self-Evaluation." in Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills, London: Sage Publications, 1981.

Cashin, William E. "Concerns About Using Student Ratings in Community Colleges." New Directions for Community Colleges, 41:57-65, 1983.

Centra, John A. "Do Student Ratings of Teachers Improve Instruction?" Change Magazine, 5:93-106. April, 1973.

_____ "Faculty Development Practices." New Directions for Higher Education: Renewing and Evaluating Teaching, 17:49-56. Spring, 1977.

Cohen, A. M. "Evaluation of Faculty." Community College Review, 2:12-21. February, 1974.

_____ and F. B. Brawer. The Who, What, Why of Instructor Evaluation. ERIC ED 060 839, 1972.

Cole, Charles C. To Improve Instruction. ERIC ED 253 583, 1978.

Cruise, Robert J.; Lyndon G. Furst; and Rudolf E. Klimes. "A Comparison of Full-Time and Part-Time Instructors at Midwestern Community Colleges." Community College Review, 8:52-56, Summer, 1980.

Doyle, Kenneth O., Jr. Evaluating Teaching. ERIC ED 237 174, 1983.

Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Analysis. New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1958.

Eliason, Carol N. Part Time Faculty: A National Perspective. ERIC ED 213 326, 1980.

Elioff, Ione H. A Study of Part-Time Faculty and Recommendations for Faculty Development at Vista College...A Noncampus Community College. ERIC ED 188 725, 1980.

Fayetteville Technical Institute. General Statutes of North Carolina: Chapter 115D: Community Collges and Technical Institutes. Fayetteville, North Carolina: Fayetteville Technical Institute, 1980.

French-Lazovik, Grace. "Peer Review--Documentary Evidence in the Evaluation of Teaching." in Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills, London: Sage Publications, 1981.

Friedlander, Jack. "An ERIC Review: Institutional Practices of Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty." Community College Review, 6:65-72. 1979.

_____ "Instructional Practices of Part-Time Faculty." New Directions for Community Colleges, 30:29-34. 1980.

Gappa, Judith M. Part-Time Faculty: Higher Education at a Crossroads. Washington, D.C., Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1984.

Greenwood, Gordon E. and Howard J. Ramagli, Jr. "Alternatives to Student Ratings of College Teaching." Journal of Higher Education. 51 (6):673-682. November/December, 1980.

Grymes, Robert J. Jr. Staff Development for Adjunct Faculty. ERIC ED 148 409, 1977.

Hammons, Jim. "Adjunct Faculty: Another Look." Community College Frontiers, 9:46-53. Winter, 1981.

Hert, Judith. "Teaching Teachers: Resistance and Writing Across the Curriculum," Inside English, XI(4), June, 1984.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Leslie, David H.; Samuel E. Kellams; and G. Manny Gunne. Part-Time Faculty in American Education. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982.

McDougle, Larry G. "Orientation Programs for Part-Time Faculty Members." Community College Review, 8:20-23, Summer, 1980.

Maher, Thomas H. and James Ebben. "The Margin of Quality: Selection and Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty." New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 18. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1978.

Manning, Patricia C. A Validation Study of the Faculty Evaluative Criteria at Florida Technological University. ERIC ED 135 828, 1975.

Mark, S. F. Faculty Evaluation Systems: A Research Study of Selected Community Colleges in New York State. ERIC ED 750 809, 1977.

Miller, Richard I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1972.

Mintzberg, H. The Structuring of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979.

National Center for Education Statistics. Projections of Education Statistics to 1990-91. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1982.

Norman, Mary M. Advice and Recommendations: Improving the Work Environment of Part-Timers. ERIC ED 254 132, 1984.

Norris, Larry. Dean of Instruction, Fayetteville Technical Institute. Personal Interview. Fayetteville, North Carolina, September 12, 1985.

Norris, William R. "Seven Premises for Improving Teacher Evaluation." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 64:30-34. March, 1980.

O'Hanlon, James and Lynn Mortensen. "Making Teacher Evaluation Work." Journal of Higher Education. 51:664-672. November/December, 1980.

Oliver, Ronald L. Evaluating University Teaching: Instructions for Departmental Chairs. ERIC ED 243 359, 1984.

Palmer, Jim. Sources and Information: Faculty and Administrator Evaluation. ERIC ED 225, 633, 1983.

Parsons, Michael H. Realizing Part-Time Faculty Potential. ERIC ED 188 717, 1980.

Pierce, Harmon B. and Rosemary T. Miller. Burlington County College Development Program for Adjunct Faculty. ERIC ED 188 717, 1980.

Poole, Lawrence H. and Donald A. Dellow. "Evaluation of Full-Time Faculty." New Directions for Community Colleges, 41:19-31, 1983.

Sewell, Donald H.; Charles W. Brydon ; and William D. Plosser. Report on a Statewide Survey about Part-Time Faculty in California Community Colleges. Sacramento: California Community and Junior College Association, 1976.

Smith, Richard R. "Developmental Needs of Community College Adjunct Faculty." Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 2:31-36. October-December, 1977.

_____ Can Participatory Programs Realize Part-Time Faculty Potential? ERIC ED 188 717, 1980.

Smith, Robert M. "The University and Part-Time Faculty: An Interdependent Relationship." ACA Bulletin, 34:61-65. October, 1980.

Smock, H. R. and T. J. Crooks. "Plan for the Comprehensive Evaluation of College Teaching." Journal of Higher Education, 44:577-586. November, 1973.

Stone, Howard L. "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: Issues and Problems." Paper presented at the 15th Annual Conference on Research in Medical Education, San Francisco, California, November 13, 1976.

Tuckman, Bruce W. Conducting Educational Research. 2nd ed. New York: Harcort Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1978.

Tuckman, Howard P. "Who Is Part-Time in Academe?" AAUP Bulletin 64:305-315, December, 1978

_____ and Barbara H. Tuckman. Who Are the Part-Timers and What Are Colleges Doing for Them? ERIC ED 213 326, 1981.

Turgeon, Mary L. Part-Time Faculty: A Comparative Profile of Characteristics and Effectiveness at Corning Community College. ERIC ED 244 654, 1983.

Willett, Lynn H. "Comparison of Instructional Effectiveness of Full- and Part-Time Faculty." Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 5:23-30, October-December, 1980.

APPENDIX A

FAYETTEVILLLE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR PERFORMANCE

Please answer the following statements about your instructor by circling "YES" or "NO".

YES	NO	1.	Is generally knowledgeable of content area.
YES	NO	2.	Is interesting in his/her presentation of the material.
YES	NO	3.	Makes course objectives clear.
YES	NO	4.	Follows stated objectives in presentation of the material.
YES	NO	5.	Makes clear assignments.
YES	NO	6.	Tells students how they will be tested and graded.
YES	NO	7.	Gives tests on the material covered.
YES	NO	8.	Returns papers and tests within a reasonable time according to type and length of paper or test and class size.
YES	NO	9.	Provides enough tests, projects and written assignments that are sufficient to evaluate the work done.
YES	NO	10.	Is available for student conferences during scheduled office hours or by appointment.
YES	NO	11.	Is concerned with student progress.
YES	NO	12.	Encourages classroom participation of the student.
YES	NO	13.	Generally begins class on scheduled time.
YES	NO	14.	Remains in classroom, lab, or shop during class period.
YES	NO	15.	Generally releases class on scheduled time.

Revised effective Fall 1985

APPENDIX B

FAYETTEVILLE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

FACULTY EVALUATIONS

PURPOSE

To establish a system for evaluation of faculty performance annually.

PHILOSOPHY

Evaluation is a routine on-going process, however a formal evaluation must be completed by the department chairperson on each faculty member annually.

A positive climate for evaluation is essential. Each faculty member has a responsibility to perform at a level of high expectation. Evaluation of performance should be a positive process that facilitates improvement. Even when the individual is not achieving the level of performance expected, the evaluation process should still be positive and should be designed to improve performance. The department chairperson should point out as specifically as possible all areas of performance that are considered to be less than satisfactory and then provide leadership, guidance and support necessary to enhance performance.

Evaluation as a basis for professional development is essential in a technical college where the knowledge and skills of all faculty and staff members must constantly be upgraded to remain current with changing technologies as well as challenging educational environments.

The heart of the evaluation process is the private conference between the department chairperson and the faculty member under his supervision. The face-to-face, straight forward, and candid communication about performance that takes place during these conferences provides an invaluable opportunity for positive and productive leadership.

As a result of these conferences the department chairperson and the faculty member should both have a clear, mutual understanding of the evaluation as well as a positive view of future performance.

Although it is impossible to remove subjectivity completely, the evaluation process should be as objective as possible. Elements of subjectivity that cannot be avoided should be addressed very professionally.

FAYETTEVILLE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

FACULTY EVALUATION

DEFINITIONS OF QUALITY RATINGS

	Quality	Explanation
1.	Does not Meet Job Requisites	This rating indicates that the individual's performance is inadequate of unsatisfactory. Specific examples must be documented. This rating could result in termination.
2.	Partially Meets Job Requisites	The individual's performance tends to be erratic and inconsistent. He/she performs satisfactorily in some areas, but falls far short in others. Unless the individual's performace improves to an acceptable level in given areas, there is serious question concerning the individual's employment status. Areas of deficiency should be noted and conditions set forth for improvement.
3.	Meets Job Requisites	This rating means the individual's performance in this area is adequate and definitely acceptable. It should be given when a faculty member performs at a level which corresponds with expectations for individuals performing the same tasks.

CRITERIA	Meets Job Requisites	Partially Meets Job Requisites	Does Not Meet Job Requisites
1. Exhibits responsible implementation of all policies and procedures of the college -- such as cooperative acceptance of teaching assignments, maintaining minimum office hours, etc. Shows an interest in Fayetteville Technical Institute.			
2. Anticipates equipment, textbook, and supply needs.			
3. Show proper concern for the care, maintenance, and security of equipment in the classroom, laboratory, shop.			
4. Promptly submits reports, grades, etc.			
5. Exhibits a cooperative attitude in the performance of all responsibilities. Keeps abreast of changes within his or her discipline.			
6. Meets classes regularly and punctually. Makes course objectives clear, informs students of criteria for testing and grading. Teaches and tests to meet objectives. Has knowledge of subject matter and uses time well.			
7. Appropriate use of instructional aids such as films, overhead projectors, maps, charts audio tapes, etc. giving consideration to subject matter and the learning needs of the students.			
8. Evaluates courses and tries to improve them.			
9. Available to students for out-of-classroom instruction and advising.			

CRITERIA	Meets Job Requisites	Partially Meets Job Requisites	Does Not Meet Job Requisites
10. Fulfills role in departmental duties as it relates to faculty meetings, advisory responsibilities, meetings as scheduled, attending and adhering to institutional faculty workday policy.			
11. Participates in professional development programs. Is active in professional associations. Works willingly on appointed committees of the college.			
12. Adheres to dress requirements.			

APPENDIX C

Comparison of the Business Division Sample Population to the Overall Population at Fayetteville Technical Institute

	TOTAL FTI	BUS. DIV	%
Full-Time Faculty	165	37	22
Adjunct Faculty	182	47	26
Students	*7220	1738	24
Curriculum	58	15	26

* Includes all students enrolled at the beginning of the Fall Quarter 1985. Due to withdrawal from classes only 1502 students of the Business Division were used in the final sample population.

Classes Taught by All Full-Time Faculty	833
In Business Division	(169)
Classes Taught by All Adjunct Faculty	392
In Business Division	(141)
Total Classes at Fayetteville Technical Institute	1225
In Business Division	(310)

APPENDIX D

Curriculum in the Business Division

Accounting

Agricultural Science

Agricultural Science and Mechanization

Banking and Finance

Business Administration

Business Computer Programming (EDP)

General Occupational Technology

General Office

Horticulture Business Technology

Industrial Management Technology

Insurance

Marketing and Retailing

Public Administration

Real Estate

Secretarial - Executive

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF PARTICIPANT

The author of this Major Applied Research Project, Edward John Jackson is a native of upstate New York. Upon graduation from Camden Central High School, Camden, New York in 1960, he enlisted in the United States Army. He served for twenty years, both as an enlisted man and an officer. He retired with the rank of Major in November, 1980.

While on active duty, he received his Associate of Arts degree from the University of Kentucky, Fort Knox campus in 1972. He received his Bachelor of Science degree in Social Science from Campbell University, Buies Creek, North Carolina in 1980. Prior to retirement, he began studying for his Master of Education degree, in Guidance and Counseling, which he obtained from Campbell University, Buies Creek, North Carolina in 1982.

After obtaining the degree of Master of Education, he was employed by Fayetteville Technical Institute as a Career/Veteran's Counselor. In 1983, Jackson became the Director of Off-Campus Curricular Programs for Fayetteville Technical Institute, the position he currently holds.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
JUL 8 1988